IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / MAY, 1982 437-439
Vol. 56, No. 4

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
TABLE OF CONTENTS
Volume 56
(August, 1981—May, 1982)

No. 1, August, 1981

ASPECTS IN RENAISSANCE SCHOLARSHIP
PAPERS PRESENTED AT
"SHAKESPEARE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES"
SYMPOSIUM, 1981

* * * * * * * * * *

No. 2, November, 1981

* * * * * * * * * * *

No. 3, February, 1982

PLANT SCIENCE LECTURE SERIES
PAPERS PRESENTED AT
"BREEDING CROP PLANTS FOR PHYSIOLOGICAL TRAITS
SYMPOSIUM, 1982

* * * * * * * * * *

FROM THE EDITORS

Regarding this issue

In the present issue of the *Iowa State Journal of Research* is a collection of articles which derive from the papers presented at Iowa State University's third symposium devoted to William Shakespeare. This collection differs from the first two in that it is a selection from the papers actually read at the symposium and for the first time includes the presentation given by the featured speaker—in this case, David Bevington of the University of Chicago. While the first two symposia had as their focus Shakespeare, his works, and their interpretation on the stage, on film, and by scholars, this one also included his contemporaries and their work. The widening of the third symposium's scope to encompass the heart of the English Renaissance signals the direction to be taken by future symposia in this series at Iowa State University. As a result of this shift in emphasis, the symposium's editors have changed the title of the series from *Aspects in Shakespearean Scholarship* to *Aspects in Renaissance Scholarship*.

In order to facilitate the use of this collection, an introduction which provides an abstract for each article has been included by the issue's editors. As presented here the papers are in a revised form, often shortened as well, and are in a different order that that of the symposium itself.

Review papers

The *Iowa State Journal of Research* solicits review papers that synthesize the present state of knowledge in specific areas of scholarly activity. We do so because we believe continuing review of the vast outpouring of new knowledge and ideas is increasingly important, and because many disciplinary journals accept only contributions that report new research.

But page charges

For many years, the *Iowa State Journal of Research*, entirely subsidized by the University, levied no page charges. In 1978, to help meet increasing publication costs, the Administrative Board of the *Journal* specified a nominal per page charge of $10. More recently it has been necessary to ask authors from other institutions to pay their own way; that is, $30 a page, which approximates production costs.

Because review or interpretational contributions are often necessarily longer than research reports, the invitation statement above may seem but a hollow pronouncement because of the barrier of page charges. The *Journal* is developing a fund to defray (in part or completely) page charges for authors who lack grant or institutional publication funding. The dispersal of such funds will be directed especially towards the support of distinguished contributions of review nature. As stated in the "Information for Authors" (back cover), contingent writers may explore the problem of funding page charges with the editor.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981
Vol. 56, No. 1

Aspects in Renaissance Scholarship

Papers presented at "Shakespeare and His Contemporaries" Symposium 1981

* *

April 23-25, 1981
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

* *

Edited by
Linda R. Galyon
and
Kenneth G. Madison

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 4
Vol. 56, No. 1

ASPECTS IN RENAISSANCE SCHOLARSHIP

CONTENTS

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 5-7
Vol. 56, No. 1

INTRODUCTION

Linda R. Galyon*

This collection of articles covers a wide range of topics relating to Shakespeare and several of his contemporaries. As an aid to the would-be reader this introduction provides a concise summary of each article. The reader will note that the articles have been divided into two broad categories: the first relates to Shakespeare and the second to his contemporaries and their interests.

David Bevington examines in " 'Why Should Calamity Be Full of Words?' The Efficacy of Cursing in *Richard III*" Shakespeare's conception of rhetoric in *Richard III* through a central question: "What is the efficacy . . . of the language of cursing in *Richard III*?" This question is in turn related to the role of providential justice in this play. Richard's fate is best understood when considered in light of the careers of his chief victims. Their careers establish a pattern generally composed of the pronouncement of a curse by some other character, then a self-curse by the person in question, then a recollection of self-cursing after the fatal events have occurred, one usually accompanied by an acknowledgment of the justice of God's wrath. Richard's responses contrast with those of his victims. He is cursed by his mother and ultimately curses himself, but he never gains an awareness of God's justice. Instead, having discovered he is not free of "coward conscience," he perceives himself cut off from penance and then dies desperately fighting odds he realizes are insuperable. In *Richard III* Shakespeare's attitude toward the power of language "tempers concern and even pessimism with a final affirmation in the triumph of truth." Words, like deeds, become weapons an all-seeing God turns against their masters.

Donald K. Anderson, Jr., in "The King's Two Rouses and Providential Revenge in *Hamlet*," argues that Claudius' two rouses, i.e., toasts or healths (I.iv.6; V.ii.283)—accompanied as they are by loud sequences of kettledrum, then trumpet flourish, then cannonfiring—both announce and link the ghost's initiating of revenge and heaven's fulfillment of it. The first and third of the three dialogue references to the rouses attribute to the sound of the cannon a cosmological effect that connotes a divine response. The second dialogue reference, together with the sound of Rouse 1 itself, plants a strong subliminal association between Rouse 1 and the ghost; when Rouse 2 occurs shortly before the death of Claudius, the audience should recall Rouse 1 and the ghost's demand for vengeance and should thus receive Rouse 2 as a signal of imminent divine justice. In the theatre the auditory effects of these two uniquely similar rouses should help give the final scene an atmosphere of providential retribution.

A treatment of the importance and significance of kneeling in Shakespearean drama is to be found in "Bringing Shakespeare's Characters Down to Earth: The Significance of Kneeling" by John T. Onuska, Jr. This paper is particularly concerned with kneeling that is not called for by stage directions but arises as a natural piece of stage business called for by the lines. The history

*Department of English, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

and significance of kneeling from the Greeks to the seventeenth-century English are sketched to provide context for study of Shakespeare's use of the gesture. Scenes from a variety of Shakespearean plays receive comment and scenes between parent and child in *Coriolanus* and *Lear* particularly close consideration. Shakespeare perceived the drama inherent in kneeling and analysis of his characters' kneeling may yield insights into Shakespeare's thought and will certainly provide keener appreciation of the physical ways in which he shaped his plays thematically.

In "Catalogue-Index to Productions of the Shakespeare Memorial/ Royal Shakespeare Theatre: 1879-1978" Michael Mullin furnishes a description of the contents of the recently published (1980) catalogue-index to productions of the Shakespeare Memorial/Royal Shakespeare Theatre, together with suggestions for the combined use of the catalogue-index and the Shakespeare Centre archival materials, which were formerly available only at Stratford-upon-Avon but have now been microfilmed by the University of Illinois Library (and Rank Xerox as well). To show how the catalogue works, this article provides a typical entry, that for the production of *Antony and Cleopatra* directed by Glen Byam Shaw in 1953. The author also suggests ways in which Shakespearean scholars and critics may fruitfully utilize the materials now made more accessible through the catalogue-index.

Anita J. Schaefer discusses some of Fuseli's important depictions of the supernatural in Shakespearean drama. Her article, "The Shape of the Supernatural: Fuseli on Shakespeare," gives primary attention to Fuseli's paintings based on *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* but also considers those of the witches in *Macbeth* and the ghosts of *Julius Caesar* and of *Hamlet*. The Shakespearean paintings of Fuseli reveal (1) his perpetual fascination with the supernatural and (2) his minimal allegiance to the texts. These were a source of inspiration rather than imitation. These Fuseli paintings richly embody the creative force of Shakespeare's influence.

Leland Poague considers in " 'Reading' the Prince: Shakespeare, Welles, and Some Aspects of *Chimes at Midnight*" how the Welles Hal differs from Shakespeare's. In *Chimes at Midnight* Welles downplays the Henriad's concern with the issue of political legitimacy. He takes out a number of lines which describe Bolingbroke's usurpation and eliminates certain key images. Of the film's four references to the usurpation, only the last more than hints at Bolingbroke's guilt. Bolingbroke's pretence to kingship, his role-acting, is not emphasized nor is Hal's theatricality. In *Chimes at Midnight* rather than gaining the throne through any drive for power or skillful self-dramatization, Hal attains it simply through time. And Welles drastically reorders Shakespeare's text to emphasize the time theme. *Chimes at Midnight* eulogizes the inevitable passing of youthful enthusiasm for existence and the failure of Falstaff's efforts to link youth and age in a timeless union. In this context Hal does not emerge as a "modern" or "Machiavelian" prince but as one marked by the idealism and sadness of the typical Wellesian hero. The mise-en-scène of this film aids importantly in the creation of this Hal.

"Equity in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries" by W. Nicholas Knight is a consideration of the concept of absolute justice or equity. The works of Shakespeare and Spenser are contrasted with those of Jonson and Middleton. The concept of equity is commended by Spenser in the *Faerie Queene* and by Shakespeare in *Comedy of Errors, Merchant of Venice,* and

Measure for Measure. Jonson approves the concept of equity in early plays such as *Every Man in His Humour* but not in the later ones, especially *Bartholomew Fair*; while Middleton, who makes highly sophisticated use of legal language, is disapproving and is particularly concerned to ridicule the corruption lawyers bring to the law. The concepts of equity embodied in these works are recognizably related to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century concerns over the function of Chancery.

In "Female Transvestism in Renaissance Comedy: 'Natural Perspective, That Is and Is Not,' " a study of the cross-dressing convention in *Gallathea, Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Twelfth Night, James IV, Philaster, Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *Cymbeline*, Shirley F. Staton argues that each play tends to make one of two uses of this convention. The first four plays listed employ gender disguise to free their heroines. In these plays the transvestite convention liberates both heroine and audience, empowering the heroine and enabling the audience to experience her invigorating license. In the last four plays cross-dressing, far from freeing the heroine, limits her to what is properly "female," while making possible the necessary self-sacrifice and patient suffering. All the plays considered conclude with the heroines unmasked and the paternalistic world firmly reestablished.

"Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy and the Providential Play-Within-a-Play" by Richard S. Ide is a study of the Providential play-within-a-play in order to document a chain of influence in the English revenge tragedy, c. 1600-1611. The plays chiefly considered are *Hamlet, Antonio's Revenge, The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, and *The Atheist's Tragedy*. In his conclusion the author briefly considers the convention studied in this paper as it appears in *Samson Agonistes*. Shakespeare and Marston establish the Providential play-within-a-play as a generic convention; Chapman alters it by downplaying the active personal involvement of Providence; and Tourneur makes double use of the convention to demonstrate the punishment of evil and reward of virtue. As late as the Caroline period the convention appears in plays by Ford and Massinger.

Charles H. Stein presents in "Justice and Revenge in *The Spanish Tragedy*" an argument that justice and revenge are neither identical nor congruent in Thomas Kyd's tragedy. The play is a tragedy of Hieronimo's disintegration as he chooses revenge in place of justice, not a testimony to the immutability of justice. In the main plot the division between justice and revenge is chiefly shown through Bel-imperia and Hieronimo: from the onset of the play she simply seeks revenge while he initially seeks justice. His words in sentencing Pedringano, moreover, emphasize justice through law, which he later seeks by his attempt to approach the king. Only when this is blocked does he turn to revenge and Machiavellian duplicity. In Act V Bel-imperia and Hieronimo together pursue revengeful courses leading to their own destruction. The exchanges between Revenge and Andrea's ghost form a choric element showing the evolution of revenge in the main plot and underscoring Hieronimo's choice of revenge rather than justice. Whatever its moral stance toward revenge, the play shows the impulse to be terrifyingly human.

The funds for the publication of this collection of articles have been provided by the Council of Interdisciplinary Programs through the Graduate College, the Iowa State University Research Foundation, and the Colleges of Design, Engineering, Home Economics, and Sciences and Humanities.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 9-21
Vol. 56, No. 1

"WHY SHOULD CALAMITY BE FULL OF WORDS?" THE EFFICACY OF CURSING IN *RICHARD III*

David Bevington*

"Why should calamity be full of words?" asks the Duchess of York in IV.iv of *Richard III*, thereby posing a question that seems central to Shakespeare's conception of rhetoric in this early historical play. What is the efficacy of language, and more precisely what is the efficacy of the language of cursing, in *Richard III*? Queen Elizabeth, for her part, having seen the downfall of her kindred and the catastrophic rise of Richard of Gloucester, is not sure that cursing can accomplish anything more than to offer emotional relief to the speaker. In answer to the Duchess of York's question, "Why should calamity be full of words," Elizabeth offers this sad tribute to the purgative value of lamentation and cursing:

> Windy attorneys to their clients's woes,
> Airy succeeders of intestate joys,
> Poor breathing orators of miseries,
> Let them have scope! Though what they will impart
> Help nothing else, yet do they ease the heart. (IV.iv.126-31)[1]

She is prepared, in other words, to join the Duchess in cursing the new king of England who has killed her kindred and her children, even though she doubts that much can come of it other than letting herself go.

Elsewhere in the play, too, speakers express scepticism as to the efficacy of cursing. In I.iii when Queen Margaret curses her enemies and prophesies their ruin, she offers to exempt Buckingham from her malediction since he is guiltless of any wrong against her house. Buckingham remains notwithstanding ungrateful and unimpressed. To her assurance that he is not "within the compass of [her] curse," Buckingham curtly rejoins, "Nor no one here; for curses never pass/ The lips of those that breathe them in the air" (I.iii.284-85). Margaret of course believes otherwise: "I will not think but they ascend the sky,/ And there awake God's gentle-sleeping peace," she retorts. Attitudes in this play toward the efficacy of cursing cover the whole range of possibilities, from Buckingham's jaded rationalism to the naive faith of Clarence's children, who, confronted with the news of their father's death, have no doubt as to what will happen: "God will revenge it, whom I will importune/ With earnest prayers all to that effect" (II.ii.14-15). They believe not only in God's sure and swift justice, but in their own ability to move God through imprecation. (Sadly enough, we realize, they are misinformed as to the true cause of their father's death and are sure that not Richard but King Edward will have to pay the reckoning.)

The question of the efficacy of cursing becomes, then, a matter of debate, one that is related to the conception of providential justice in the play. Do curses and prayers have an effective power over destiny? Does the

*Department of English, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

actual pronouncing of certain words form a part of the process by which events are fulfilled? Are the curses spoken by Margaret and others necessary to the completion of the acts of which they speak? Why should Margaret, herself guilty of heinous atrocities in the Yorkist-Lancastrian wars, be able to move God to action by her entreaties? Are her prayers as effective as those of Clarence's innocent children? Can there be any power in Margaret's words, or is she merely a prophetess of what must be? If the latter, why does God choose such a guilt-ridden railer as his spokesman?

In this analysis I should like to focus on Richard of Gloucester's own attitudes toward these questions. I should like to examine his studious attempts to avoid, first of all, the curses of others, including Margaret, and second, the self-cursing to which his victims fall unwittingly prone. I should then like to examine the process by which Richard does in fact fall prey both to the curses of others (in particular, his mother) and to self-cursing, despite his efforts to escape such entrapments. This reversal seems to me, in fact, an integral part of the *peripeteia* of *Richard III* and leads toward Richard's *anagnorisis* or discovery—too late for him, of course—as to the true nature of imprecatory language.

Before looking at Richard himself, let me first survey the tragic careers of his chief victims, in order to formulate the pattern against which Richard's actions are to be properly understood. That pattern seems generally to require both the pronouncement of a curse by some other character and the pronouncement of a self-curse by the person in question, though both events need not always be shown and may in some instances have occurred prior to the commencement of the play. The pattern completes itself in the recollection of self-cursing after the fatal events have come to pass, a recollection that is usually accompanied by an acknowledgment of the justice of God's wrath.

The Lady Anne is the first of Richard's victims to curse herself. Even before Richard has approached her with his outlandishly successful wooing, even as she is escorting the dead body of her father-in-law, Henry VI, to burial with tears in her eyes, Anne pronounces her own doom. She begins by cursing the murderer of her father-in-law and her husband, Prince Edward, but then turns to cursing Richard's offspring and any woman who could make the fatal error of marrying such a monster:

> If ever he have child, abortive be it,
> Prodigious, and untimely brought to light,
> Whose ugly and unnatural aspect
> May fright the hopeful mother at the view,
> And that be heir to his unhappiness!
> If ever he have wife, let her be made
> More miserable by the life of him
> Than I am made by my young lord and thee! (I.ii.21-28)

The audience is aware of the irony in this self-cursing, even though the wooing itself has not yet commenced, since Richard has previously confided to us his intention of winning Anne for his wife. He has also anticipated for us the point of this self-cursing, namely that we, knowing beforehand the enormity of her betrayal of self, see Anne going willfully to her own destruction. As Richard sardonically puts it:

> What though I kill'd her husband and her father?
> The readiest way to make the wench amends
> Is to become her husband and her father,
> The which will I. (I.i.154-57)

Or as he exults afterwards:

> What? I, that kill'd her husband and his father,
> To take her in her heart's extremest hate,
> With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes,
> The bleeding witness of my hatred by,
> Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me,
> And I no friends to back my suit withal,
> But the plain devil and dissembling looks?
> And yet to win her! All the world to nothing! (I.ii.230-37)

Anne's self-cursing has served, then, as a means of emphasizing her awareness of the moral consequences of her fall. Like Eve, she has been armed with knowledge of good and evil, and yet has chosen evil because she is prone to flattery and deception.

Anne's self-cursing also serves as anticipation of her recognition of the justice of her fall. As she reluctantly prepares, in IV.i, for the unwelcome coronation in which she is to play the role of queen, she recalls her earlier words that have led to her present misery:

> O, when, I say, I look'd on Richard's face,
> This was my wish: "Be thou," quoth I, "accurs'd
> For making me, so young, so old a widow!
> And, when thou wed'st, let sorrow haunt thy bed;
> And be thy wife—if any be so mad—
> More miserable by the life of thee
> Than thou hast made me by my dear lord's death!" (IV.i.70-76)

Although she alters the circumstance of this recollection, thinking of herself as having said directly to Richard the words she actually spoke in soliloquy before his entrance, Anne does repeat the substance of her earlier statement and reports almost word for word the crucially operative phrase: "And be thy wife—if any be so mad— / More miserable by the life of thee/ Than thou hast made me by my dear lord's death!" Shakespeare is unafraid of repetition in such circumstances; it is a part of the copiousness, subtly altered by *variatio*, that goes to make up the "fullness of words" of which the Duchess of York spoke.

Buckingham's career follows a similar pattern, even though he is manifestly more guilty than Anne of sinful conduct. First there is Margaret's warning, offered in a friendly spirit since Buckingham has done her no wrong. "O Buckingham, take heed of yonder dog," she admonishes him. "Look when he fawns, he bites; and when he bites,/ His venom tooth will rankle to the death./ Have not to do with him, beware of him;/ Sin, death, and hell have set their marks on him,/ And all their ministers attend on him " (I.iii.288-93). Buckingham predictably fails to heed the warning, despite Margaret's further

insistence that Richard will one day "split [Buckingham's] very heart with sorrow" and Buckingham will "say poor Margaret was a prophetess" (I.iii. 299-300). Like Anne, Buckingham proceeds to cursing of himself having been granted a full knowledge of the consequences. In the presence of the dying King Edward, who repeatedly adjures his courtiers not to dally before their king "Lest he that is the supreme King of kings/ Confound your hidden falsehood, and award/ Either of you to be the other's end" (II.i.13-15),[2] Buckingham calls down upon himself his own well-deserved destiny. Turning to Queen Elizabeth, with whose kindred he has been factious, he solemnly intones:

> Whenever Buckingham doth turn his hate
> Upon your Grace, but with all duteous love
> Doth cherish you and yours, God punish me
> With hate in those where I expect most love!
> When I have most need to employ a friend,
> And most assured that he is a friend,
> Deep, hollow, treacherous, and full of guile
> Be he unto me! This do I beg of God,
> When I am cold in love to you or yours. (II.i.32-40)

It is hardly surprising, perhaps, that Buckingham immediately proceeds to violate this oath by conspiring with Richard to deny Prince Edward the throne, since Buckingham (as we have seen) has already expressed his conviction that oaths are but idle speeches going no further than the lips of those who utter them. As Richard's chief supporter and henchman, moreover, he is most like Richard in his delight and ability in using rhetoric and double entendre to deceive others. He is the practiced Machiavel, able to "counterfeit the deep tragedian,/ Speak and look back, and pry on every side,/ Tremble and start at wagging of a straw;/ Intending deep suspicion, ghastly looks/ Are at my service, like enforced smiles" (III.v.5-9).

In his downfall, however, Buckingham learns—too late for him—the true efficacy of the words spoken not only by Margaret but by himself.[3] Noting that his arrest has appropriately fallen on All Souls' Day, he draws the necessary conclusion:

> Why, then All-Souls' day is my body's doomsday.
> This is the day which, in King Edward's time,
> I wish'd might fall on me, when I was found
> False to his children and his wife's allies;
> This is the day wherein I wish'd to fall
> By the false faith of him whom most I trusted;
> This, this All-Souls' day to my fearful soul
> Is the determin'd respite of my wrongs.
> That high All-Seer which I dallied with
> Hath turn'd my feigned prayer on my head
> And given in earnest what I begg'd in jest.
> Thus doth he force the swords of wicked men
> To turn their own points in their masters' bosoms.
> Thus Margaret's curse falls heavy on my neck:
> "When he," quoth she, "shall split thy heart with sorrow,

> Remember Margaret was a prophetess."
> Come, lead me, officers, to the block of shame;
> Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame. (V.i.12-29)

Again we see Shakespeare's conscious rhetorical repetition of the operative words. What seemed before to Buckingham empty speech has now become confirmation of a providential pattern, by which men are fully warned and then brought low through their own devisings; their own swords are turned against their own bosoms.[4] The curse is efficacious not as magic but as prophecy of a just process in which wicked men undo themselves. The prophetess Margaret goes unheeded at first, like Cassandra, because men are too often blind to their own weaknesses and to the omnipresence of a providential force that will exact punishment for sin. Buckingham is like Richard in his calculated villainy, but differs importantly from him (as do virtually all of Richard's victims) in his free acknowledgment of the justice of divine retribution: "Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame." Rather than complain at the seeming injustice of his being betrayed by his former ally, he bends his last thoughts to the acknowledgment of a divine necessity in what has happened. Even Buckingham, then, the most seemingly unregenerate of Richard's one-time cohorts, participates in a kind of spiritual *anagnorisis* that, as we shall see, is denied solely to the play's protagonist.

Clarence's sorrow for his own wrongdoing is so eloquently dramatized in his great jail scene that it scarcely needs elaboration here. His swearing and forswearing have all taken place before the commencement of *Richard III*, and the recollection of these events in I.iv by a man about to die serves to heighten the emphasis on contrition as a means of appeasing God's just wrath. One aspect of the scene, however, requires some analysis here, and that is the extent of emphasis on perjury. The first ghost whom Clarence encounters in his dream, renowned Warwick, asks the pointed question: "What scourge for perjury/ Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?" (ll.50-51). The charge is telling enough, since Clarence is guilty of having solemnly engaged himself to Warwick's daughter before switching perfidiously back again to the Yorkist side. Next the ghost of Edward, the Lancastrian Prince of Wales, takes up a similar cry: "Clarence is come—false, fleeting, perjur'd Clarence,/ That stabb'd me in the field by Tewkesbury" (ll.55-56). Edward too had reason to hope better of Clarence, in view of Clarence's brief Lancastrian alliance. By taking up both sides of the Lancastrian-Yorkist struggle, in fact, Clarence had of necessity perjured himself toward both sides. It is this treachery that the second murderer holds up to Clarence as the cause of his imminent execution: "And that same vengeance doth [God] hurl on thee,/ For false forswearing and for murder too" (ll.204-05). Clarence protests rightly enough that his own crimes will not excuse those of his executioners, but he also possesses the philosophical perspective necessary to realize that God's justice is at work even through evil agents. Early in the play, then, we are shown the moralized form of *anagnorisis* to which most of the flawed characters, though not Richard, will be subjected.

Other characters can be dealt with more briefly. Hastings' career fully exemplifies the pattern we are exploring here. He is cursed by Margaret for having been present at the murder of her son Rutland, but plainly indicates by his contemptuous reply to her that he has not yet learned to take prophecy

seriously: "False-boding women, end thy frantic curse,/ Lest to thy harm thou move our patience," he retorts (I.iii.246-47). He proceeds to curse himself in the presence of the dying King Edward by swearing an end to his hatred of the queen's allies. The hollowness of this oath becomes the subject of much double-entrendre in the bitterly ironic scenes preceding Hastings' arrest, for it is the news of the execution of Rivers, Vaughan, and Grey that persuades Hastings of Richard's continued affection and trust toward him. He is unwilling to see the resemblance between his own plight and that of his enemies, despite Derby's warning that "The lords at Pomfret, when they rode from London,/ Were jocund, and suppos'd their states were sure" (III.ii.83-84); Hastings is blinded by his own overconfidence and obsessive desire for revenge at any cost. And it is this desire for revenge, and his consequent perjury, that necessitate (as he perceives it) the just anger of the Almighty:

> I now repent I told the pursuivant,
> As too triumphing, how mine enemies
> Today at Pomfret bloodily were butcher'd,
> And I myself secure in grace and favor.
> O Margaret, Margaret, now thy heavy curse
> Is lighted on poor Hastings' wretched head! (III.iv.88-93)

Again, like Buckingham, and others, Hastings expresses no resentment or sense of injustice at the fact of Richard's triumph over him but focuses instead on his realization that Richard's villainy has paradoxically served a just cause as far as Hastings is concerned. Once again the swords of wicked men have turned their own points into their masters' bosoms.[5]

In a similar fashion, the queen's kindred, Rivers, Grey, and Vaughan, are cursed by Margaret for being accessories to Rutland's death, forswear and perjure themselves in the presence of both their temporal and eternal king, and concede at the time of their arrest the appropriateness of their doom (though they also protest that their deaths will be "guiltless" and "unjust," III.iii). They ask only that God hear their prayers as well, and carry out justice on Richard and Buckingham according to Margaret's prophecy as he has done in their own case.

King Edward IV, too, is cursed by Margaret. His crimes have for the most part been committed in *Henry VI, Part III*, but we are shown the scene of his recognition in which he confesses his perjured ingratitude toward his brother Clarence and laments, as he is led away to his death chamber, "O God, I fear thy justice will take hold/ On me, and you, and mine, and yours for this" (II.i.132-33).

What these various case histories suggest is that, in this play, self-cursing is essential to the process by which divine providence works its justice upon individuals. The pronouncement of a curse by Margaret or some other person does not in itself have a causative or magical function; it is rather a form of warning, so that the individual may see that he is fairly appraised of the consequence of his perjuries. Self-cursing is a still more heightened manifestation of this necessary foreknowledge on the part of the one who is to perpetrate evil, and is even, in a metaphorical sense, a form of contract signed between the individual and his destiny. The evil deeds range from Anne's betrayal of no one other than herself, to Hastings' vengeful conspiracy against his political

enemies, to Buckingham's cool practice of political murder in the presumably safe knowledge that oaths are no more than empty words spoken to deceive. In virtually every case, an essential part of the spiritual fall is the committing of perjury, and an essential part of spiritual recognition is the acknowledgment of that perjury and the acceptance of its consequences.

Let us now turn to Richard of Gloucester, himself. What I want to illustrate here is the way in which his response to cursing and self-cursing differs at every turn from the responses of his victims, no matter how wicked some of them may have been. Richard does his best to avoid being cursed by others, including Margaret, and manages for a long time to avoid a direct pronouncement in his presence of such a curse. He is especially clever at avoiding self-cursing, until the moment of inevitable reversal finally arrives. And his belated recognition of the consequences of cursing and self-cursing brings with it not acquiescence but despair. The "coward conscience" he has despised in others becomes in him not a teacher but a nemesis.

First, let us look at the attempts of other characters to curse Richard to his face. Of course he is cursed in his absence by many persons in the play, increasingly so as the play goes on, but we also see that he goes to extraordinary lengths to avoid being cursed directly to his face. It is as though he is far more aware than the others of the dangers of hearing a curse pronounced on him. This difference is in fact wholly understandable. The others, no matter how guiltily involved, are to a greater or lesser extent blinded to their own failings and thus are in no position to understand what cursing can mean for them; or, like Buckingham, they simply do not believe in the power of cursing. Richard, whose evil is wholly without pretense or illusion, knows that his utterances are calculatedly insincere, and yet at the same time entertains a superstitious fear of cursing. He is a deliberate villain, then, who adopts quasi-legalistic means to avoid exposing himself to liability of outright perjury.

This tactic first manifests itself in I.iii when Queen Margaret concludes her litany of curses by turning, suitably enough, to the greatest troublemaker of them all, Richard himself.[6] When Richard chides her for cursing in turn Edward IV, Edward V, Queen Elizabeth, Rivers, Dorset, and Hastings, and bids her be done with her "charm"—suggesting that Richard views her as indeed a witch whose potent evil is to be avoided—she retorts with her strongest curse of all:

> And leave out thee? Stay, dog, for thou shalt hear me.

(Note that the phrase "Stay dog," suggests that Richard is trying to sneak away.)

> If heaven have any grievous plague in store
> Exceeding those that I can wish upon thee,
> O, let them keep it till thy sins be ripe,
> And then hurl down their indignation
> On thee, the troubler of the poor world's peace!
> The worm of conscience still begnaw thy soul!
> Thy friends suspect for traitors while thou liv'st,
> And take deep traitors for thy dearest friends!
> No sleep close up that deadly eye of thine,
> Unless it be while some tormenting dream
> Affrights thee with a hell of ugly devils!
> Thou elvish-mark'd, abortive, rooting hog,

> Thou that wast seal'd in thy nativity
> The slave of nature and the son of hell!
> Thou slander of thy heavy mother's womb,
> Thou loathed issue of thy father's loins,
> Thou rag of honor, thou detested— (I.iii.214-32)

And at this point Richard interrupts with her name, "Margaret." She, thrown off her stride, replies "Richard!" He responds "Ha!" and she replies in turn, "I call thee not."

> *Richard.* I cry thee mercy then, for I did think
> That thou hadst call'd me all these bitter names.
>
> *Queen Margaret.* Why, so I did, but look'd for no reply.
> O, let me make the period to my curse!
>
> *Richard.* 'Tis done by me, and ends in "Margaret."

And Queen Elizabeth ends this colloquy by observing to Margaret,

> Thus have you breath'd your curse against yourself. (I.iii.234-39)

Richard has thus deflected Margaret's anger onto Queen Elizabeth and with a shystering quibble has avoided the "period" to Margaret's curse.[7] It is a paltry quibble, of course, but it does strongly suggest Richard's interest in avoiding by whatever means the technical and legal fact of a curse that would otherwise light on him and name him culprit. Another ironic effect of this exchange is that Margaret herself has now unwittingly joined those who have cursed themselves.

A further instance of this cunning evasion occurs when Richard encounters his mother, the Duchess of York, for the first time in the play. She has already indicated, in her conversation with her grandchildren, the son and daughter of Clarence, her realization that Richard is a vicious deceiver and a grievous cause of shame to her. She represents then, to Richard, a very real danger, a person against whom he cannot readily proceed because she is his mother, and yet one who knows him for what he really is—unlike Anne, Hastings, Queen Elizabeth, and the rest, who are to a greater or lesser extent fooled by Richard's histrionic ability. The Duchess of York possesses, moreover, a potent weapon for those believing in, or superstitiously fearful of, the power of cursing: a mother's blessing or her curse.

In this context, then, let us examine their first colloquy. It occurs after the death of Edward IV, when the peers of the realm are gathering to jockey for position. Richard comes in with Buckingham, Derby, Hastings, and others, sees his mother, and adopts as his first order of business the asking of her blessing:

> *Richard.* Madam, my mother, I do cry you mercy;
> I did not see your Grace. Humbly on my knee
> I crave your blessing. [*Kneels.*]

> *Duchess of York.* God bless thee; and put meekness in thy breast,
> Love, charity, obedience, and true duty!
>
> *Richard.* Amen!— [*Aside*] And make me die a good old man!
> That is the butt-end of a mother's blessing;
> I marvel that her Grace did leave it out. (II.ii.104-11)

I do not want to read this exchange with too serious a tone on Richard's part; Sir Laurence Olivier, for example, delivers Richard's aside in a mocking tone, and I would agree that a sardonic and even flippant air is more dramatically suitable than genuine concern or alarm. I would argue, however, that the sarcasm masks but does not entirely conceal an awareness on Richard's part that a mother's curse is something well avoided.[8]

In fact, throughout the period of Richard's ascendancy to power, Richard never adopts Buckingham's easy—and fallacious—assumption that oaths "never pass/ The lips of those that breathe them in the air." Although Richard is utterly Machiavellian in his manipulation of rhetoric, he does not fall into the self-cursing by which the others seal a contract of perjury until late in the play. In the presence of the dying Edward IV, while Buckingham, Hastings, and others use such phrases as "So thrive I and mine," "and so swear I," and "whenever I . . . God punish me . . . This do I beg of heaven," Richard is conveniently absent. Entering a short while later in the same scene, he employs a far safer form of hypothetical statement:

> if any here,
> By false intelligence, or wrong surmise,
> Hold me a foe;
> If I unwittingly, or in my rage,
> Have aught committed that is hardly borne
> By any in this presence, I desire
> To reconcile me to his friendly peace. (II.i.54-60)

Not, "May God punish me," or "This do I beg of heaven," but "I desire to reconcile me." Richard is lying, of course, but he is not signing a contract for perjury.

The odd fact is that Richard, quite unlike his later counterparts Iago and Edmund, with whom he is so often compared, is a superstitious man. He fears omens and prognostications, even if he also acts as though he will be able to circumvent those omens by the sheer force of his own wit.

Despite Richard's cleverness in avoiding for a long while the actual formulation of a curse upon himself by others or by himself, he does ultimately capitulate on both scores: he submits to the curses of his mother, and he does contractually tie his whole success to the performing of vows he does not in fact intend to honor. How and why do these crucial reversals occur?

They come about in IV.iv, after Richard has become king, and importantly just after he has committed his most unforgivable crime, the murder of the two young princes. It is just at this point that Richard's sure control of his world begins to falter. He recalls the prophecy uttered by Henry VI that Richmond will be king, and he becomes obsessed, like Macbeth, with a plot to kill this rival and thereby alter destiny itself. He broods over the fact that he

has recently visited a place called Rouge-mont, in Exeter—a name of ominous import to his superstitious mind in view of a prophecy, uttered by an Irish bard, that he will not live long after having beheld Richmond (IV.ii.95-107). These divine prognostications are quite unlike those afforded Richard's victims; those persons receive warnings which they might have heeded, and later realize their mistake, whereas Richard's prognostications take the form of the announcement of unavoidable doom which Richard may try to evade by prevarications and desperate cover-up murders but which will ultimately spell his doom. That is why we can say that his credence of dreams and omens is merely superstitious in him, whereas in his victims the final acknowledgment of the truth of prophetic utterance is a sign of spiritual discovery.

Richard is then indeed superstitious and fearful of prophetic utterance, unlike the suave and assured Buckingham earlier in the play. And perhaps it is this growing fear that most of all renders Richard incapable of fending off his mother's curse as he had earlier deflected Margaret's curse with a quibble. The Duchess of York, stung into speech by the deaths of her grandchildren, resolves at last to be "copious in exclaims" and to say what must now be said. Accompanied by Queen Elizabeth, she interrupts Richard on his expedition against Buckingham, in order to arraign Richard on charges of having murdered his own kinsmen. His response is, naturally, another attempt at evasion, although of a rather desperate and crude sort: he orders his trumpets and drums to flourish and strike so that the effective words cannot be heard: "Let not the heavens hear these tell-tale women/ Rail on the Lord's anointed. Strike, I say!" (IV.iv.150-51). The Duchess is not to be denied her speech on this occasion, however, and finally the awful words are spoken:

> Therefore take with thee my most grievous curse,
> Which, in the day of battle, tire thee more
> Than all the complete armor that thou wear'st!
> My prayers on the adverse party fight;
> And there the little souls of Edward's children
> Whisper the spirits of thine enemies
> And promise them success and victory.
> Bloody thou art, bloody will be thy end;
> Shame serves thy life and doth thy death attend. (ll.188-96)

The language of this curse meaningfully anticipates that of the ghosts who visit Richard in his tent on the night before Bosworth Field.

The pattern of Richard's reversal cannot be completed by the Duchess' cursing, however. He must also curse himself. This he does in a desperate attempt to win from Queen Elizabeth an agreement that he be permitted to marry her daughter. The wooing scene is often compared with the earlier wooing of the Lady Anne, and indeed Richard afterwards thinks he has won this suit also because he is once again dealing with a "Relenting fool, and shallow, changing woman" (l.431). In fact, however, Queen Elizabeth remains in control throughout.[9] What she finally exacts from Richard is the self-cursing he has never before uttered. First, he ties his whole military enterprise to the performance of his vows:

> Madam, so thrive I in my enterprise
> And dangerous success of bloody wars,

> As I intend more good to you and yours
> Than ever you or yours by me were harm'd! (ll.236-39)

And when this oath will not serve, since, as Queen Elizabeth acidly observes, Richard has already profaned everything else by which a man might swear, he finally throws his spiritual welfare and his very life into the bargain:

> As I intend to prosper and repent,
> So thrive I in my dangerous affairs
> Of hostile arms! Myself myself confound!
> Heaven and fortune bar me happy hours!
> Day, yield me not thy light, nor, night, thy rest!
> Be opposite all planets of good luck
> To my proceeding, if, with dear heart's love,
> Immaculate devotion, holy thoughts,
> I tender not thy beauteous princely daughter! (ll.397-405)

What more binding or appropriate contract for perjury could providence require?[10] Like Doctor Faustus, Richard has seen the dire warning—*Homo, fuge*—and yet has, as it were, set his hand to paper using his own heart's blood.

I should mention that this pattern of cursing and self-cursing appears nowhere in Shakespeare's possible sources or analogues. In *The True Tragedy of Richard III*, Richard sends Lovell as ambassador to Queen Elizabeth to gain her consent to the marriage of her daughter. In the Latin *Richardus Tertius* Richard woos the Lady Elizabeth for himself. In neither instance does he commit himself to any sort of contract for perjury. The earlier scene of Margaret's cursing and the round of self-curses pronounced by Buckingham, Hastings, and the rest in the presence of the dying King Edward, are both absent from Edward Hall's *Union of the Two Noble Families* and its incorporated reprinting of Thomas More's *Life of Richard III*. More reports merely that in Edward's presence "as by their words appeared, each forgave other, and joined their hands together, when as it after appeared by their deeds their hearts were far asunder."[11]

Let me conclude by observing that Richard's *anagnorisis* is wholly unlike that of any of his victims or former partners.[12] In a sense, he learns little in the dream sequence when he is visited in turn by the ghosts of his victims, for he has always been conscious of his own villainy and wary of the consequences of cursing. The dream sequence is more a fulfillment and choric repetition of what he has feared than a healthful revelation to Richard of God's justice. At no time does he indicate a new awareness of what providence has been intending. What he realizes instead is that "coward conscience" has the power to inflict itself on one who had wanted to believe himself free of its strictures. The theme of conscience's relevation to him is "Perjury, perjury, in the highest degree,/ Murder, stern murder, in the direst degree" (V.iii. 196-97), for which he must despair and die. Forced at last to judge himself by the standards embodied in those words, and obliged to concede their absolute truth, he perceives himself cut off from the curative process of penance and so goes to his death (like Macbeth) in a desperate resolve to fight the odds he now knows to be insuperable.

Shakespeare's attitude toward the power of language in this early play thus tempers concern and even pessimism with a final affirmation in the triumph of truth. Throughout the early history plays he shows us how language can be manipulated for evil purposes, not only in Richard of Gloucester, but in Joan of Arc, Suffolk, Richard Plantagenet, the Bishop of Winchester, and many others. On the other hand, we also sense the vibrant power of language to invoke patriotic and moral responses, as in the ringing recital of Lord Talbot's titles, and in Henry of Richmond's oration to his army at Bosworth Field. Certainly in *Richard III* it becomes apparent at last that curses and prayers do not merely vanish into air once they are spoken, as Buckingham avers. Instead, as he himself later acknowledges, a person's words, like his deeds, become swords which an all-seeing God turns against their masters' bosoms. "Wrong hath but wrong, and blame the due of blame."

NOTES

[1] Quotations are from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 3rd ed. (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1980).

[2] These lines are quoted to demonstrate how a man's private vengeance can be an instrument of divine justice, by Michael Quinn, "Providence in Shakespeare's Yorkist Plays," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 19 (1959), 45-52.

[3] A. L. French, "The Mills of God and Shakespeare's Early History Plays," *English Studies*, 55 (1974), 313-24, notes here the pattern of unwitting self-cursing and later fulfillment but argues that the prophecy is fulfilled in an ironic and indirect way, since it is Buckingham's hesitation about the young Princes' murder that occasions his downfall. Other prophecies, too, are fulfilled only in part and only in a paradoxical sense, as French observes.

[4] Wilbur Sanders, *The Dramatist and the Received Idea* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 96-97, refers to this device as a "mechanism of retribution," stressing that which is mechanical even in the providential order of this play and that which is platitudinous in Buckingham's idea *about* Providence, not *of* Providence.

[5] Wolfgang Clemen, *A Commentary on Shakespeare's* Richard III (London: Methuen, 1968), pp. 140-41, stresses that Hastings, as one who is wholly blind and obsessed in the conviction of his own security, is a suitable spokesman to enlarge on his own fate as an *exemplum* of the fall of princes.

[6] For a discussion of this curse in the context of a pattern of prophecy, fulfillment, and recapitulation, see Aerol Arnold, "The Recapitulation Dream in *Richard III* and *Macbeth*," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 6 (1955), 51-62. See also the discussion of foreshadowing and cross-referencing in Wolfgang Clemen, "Tradition and Originality in Shakespeare's *Richard III*," *Shakespeare Quarterly*,

5 (1954), 247-57, and in Clemen, "Anticipation and Foreboding in Shakespeare's Early Histories," *Shakespeare Survey*, 6 (1953), 25-35.

[7] Edward I. Berry, *Patterns of Decay: Shakespeare's Early Histories* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975), pp. 82-83, similarly observes that Richard's wit in deflecting this curse from himself to Margaret by inserting her name is only a temporary victory, and that in time Margaret's vision of vengeance in store for Richard will come to fruition.

[8] A. P. Rossiter, *Angel with Horns*, ed. Graham Storey, (New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961), p. 18, misses this point, I think, when he speaks of Richard's "thoroughly unholy reception of his mother's blessing, spoken as he gets up off his dutiful knees."

[9] I agree with S. L. Tanner that Richard does not triumph over Elizabeth in this scene; see his "Richard III Versus Elizabeth: An Interpretation," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 24 (1973), 468-72, an article written to answer that by Louis E. Dollarhide, "Two Unassimilated Movements of *Richard III*: An Interpretation," *Mississippi Quarterly*, 14 (1960), 40-46. Clemen, *A Commentary on Shakespeare's* Richard III, pp. 190-92, also believes that it is Elizabeth who capitulates, even though she shows herself intellectually superior to her opponent.

[10] Sanders, *The Dramatist and the Received Idea*, p. 99, reads in these lines "not so much an oath as a gesture of defiance towards the supernatural order which is shamelessly invoked to buttress dissimulation." I think Sanders overlooks Richard's reluctance to pronounce such an oath, but in any case the fatal consequences of his doing so are apparent to the audience.

[11] *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, III (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960), 254, here modernized in spelling and punctuation.

[12] For an argument that Shakespeare relies here on the *ars moriendi* tradition to dramatize the example of an evil king dying evilly, see Bettie Anne Doebler, " 'Despaire and Dye': The Ultimate Temptation of Richard III," *Shakespeare Survey*, 7 (1974), 75-85. On Richard's being forced to see himself for what he is, from the point of view of the Christian and political morality that condemns him, see Richard P. Wheeler, "History, Character, and Conscience in *Richard III*," *Comparative Drama*, 5 (1971-72), 301-21, and Berry, *Patterns of Decay*, p. 99.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 23-29
Vol. 56, No. 1

THE KING'S TWO ROUSES AND PROVIDENTIAL REVENGE IN *HAMLET*

Donald K. Anderson, Jr.*

The fifth act of *Hamlet* is now generally regarded as providential.[1] But the commentators, though arguing successfully for a providential story, have not adequately explained how an ambience appropriate for this story is supposed to be achieved. *Hamlet* was written to be performed; therefore, the sights and sounds to be experienced by its audience should not be slighted. With this in mind, I shall offer an idea about the staging of *Hamlet* that, to my knowledge, no critics have presented. It pertains to Claudius' two rouses (toasts, healths) in Act I and Act V—more specifically, to the unusual sound effect accompanying each of these toasts: a striking sequence of kettledrum followed by trumpet flourish followed by cannon firing. When experienced in the theatre, this auditory device should help considerably, I believe, in creating in the final scene an atmosphere of providential retribution.

The first of the two rouses is heard in the fourth scene of Act I (I.iv.6)[2] while Hamlet, with Horatio and Marcellus, is watching for the ghost they have described to him; Hamlet then explains the custom to Horatio (I.iv.8-12). The second rouse is heard in the final scene of the play (V.ii.283), immediately after Hamlet has scored the first hit in a fencing match with Laertes; a few lines earlier, Claudius has described the rouse to his entire court (V.ii.275-78). Prior to these two sound effects, the dialogue contains a third description of them: in the second scene of Act I, Claudius announces to his court that as an expression of his pleasure that Hamlet has remained at Elsinore the great cannon will be fired as part of the royal toasts (I.ii.125-28).

The two rouses should be loud, similar, and different from all other sound effects in the play. Their loudness seems undeniable because of the kettledrum, the trumpets, and most of all, the cannon.[3] Rouse 2 probably should have somewhat greater volume because, unlike Rouse 1, Claudius makes the toast on stage. However, as we shall see later, Rouse 1 comes unexpectedly and is meant to startle us as well as Horatio; therefore, an impressive sound effect is needed. That the two rouses are to be similar also seems obvious. Although the stage direction in the text for Rouse 1 omits a drum, Hamlet's reference five lines later to "kettle-drum" (I.iv.11) indicates that this stage direction is incomplete. Finally, the two rouses are different from the play's other sound effects. Prior to Rouse 2 (Act V) no cannon has been fired except for that in Rouse 1 (Act I); after Rouse 2 and the death of Hamlet, more cannon firing is heard but is not part of a rouse. Some modern productions have added one or more rouses elsewhere in the play, and other productions have eliminated one or both of the original pair;[4] but if their uniqueness is preserved, the audience upon hearing Rouse 2 should recall Rouse 1.[5]

Besides the rouses themselves, the three references to them in the dialogue are noteworthy. For one thing, the first and third of these descriptions attribute to the sound of the cannon a cosmological effect that connotes a

*Department of English, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201

divine response. The first description, given by Claudius to his court in Act I, occurs two scenes before the first rouse: "But the great cannon to the clouds shall tell,/ And the King's rouse the heaven shall bruit again,/ Respeaking earthly thunder" (I.ii.126-28).[6] The third description, also given by Claudius, occurs in Act V at the beginning of the fencing match and only six lines before the second rouse: "And let the kettle to the trumpet speak,/ The trumpet to the cannoneer without,/ The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth,/ 'Now the King drinks to Hamlet' " (V.ii.275-78). Also helping to create a cosmological ambience throughout the play are several passages that juxtapose *heaven* and *earth*. The best known is Hamlet's comment in Act I to Horatio about the ghost: "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,/ Than are dreamt of in your philosophy" (I.v.166-67). Another instance is Laertes' protest in Act IV to Claudius about the death of Polonius: "His means of death. . ./ Cry to be heard, as 'twere from heaven to earth,/ That I must call't in question" (IV.v.214, 217-18).[7]

Let us now turn to Rouse 1, which involves the second of the play's three references to rouses in the dialogue. As the fourth scene of the first act begins, we in the audience, as well as Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus, tensely await the ghost near midnight on the battlements of Elsinore. But there is more in store for us. While anxiously watching for the spectre, we soon are listening for something else: the clock's striking of twelve, for the three men disagree about the time. Suddenly our attentive ears are surprised by a much different sound: a loud sequence of kettledrum, trumpets, and cannon. We momentarily share Horatio's confusion—"What does this mean, my lord?" (I.iv.7), but Hamlet's explanation to him reminds us of Claudius' earlier instructions about rouses. Hamlet says to Horatio: "The King doth wake to-night and takes his rouse,/ Keeps wassail, and the swagg'ring up-spring reels;/ And as he drains his draughts of Rhenish down,/ The kettle-drum and trumpet thus bray out/ The triumph of his pledge" (I.iv.8-12). Our attention now having been shifted to Rouse 1 both by its sound and then by Hamlet's explanation, we are quite startled by the entrance of the ghost. An important result of this entire sequence is the subliminal planting in our minds of a strong association between Rouse 1 and the ghost, so strong that, when we hear Rouse 2 in Act V shortly before the death of Claudius, we should recall not only Rouse 1 but also the ghost together with its demand for vengeance later in Act I. In other words, the two very similar and very strident rouses in *Hamlet* both announce and link the ghost's initiating of revenge and heaven's fulfillment of it.[8]

Before examining Rouse 2, let us note, first of all, some of the references to providence earlier in Act V. Two well-known examples are Hamlet's comments to Horatio in the second scene: "There's a divinity that shapes our ends,/ Rough-hew them how we will" (V.ii.10-11) and, shortly before the fencing match, "There is special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be [now], 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it [will] come—the readiness is all" (V.ii.219-22). These two passages early in the play's final scene indicate Hamlet's acceptance of providence.[9]

Two other matters merit attention at this point. One is the imagery of backfiring ordnance used several times in the play. The best known instance is Hamlet's anticipation in Act III of outwitting Rosencrantz and Guildenstern on the trip to England: "For 'tis sport to have the enginer/ Hoist with his own petar" (III.iv.206-07). Another example is Claudius' advice to Laertes in Act IV

that their use of the unbated and poisoned foil against Hamlet should "have a back or second, that might hold/ If this did blast in proof" (IV.vii.153-54).[10] Such passages foreshadow not only Rouse 2, in which heaven, previously described as "respeaking earthly thunder" (I.ii.128), reverberates the firing of the great cannon, but also the dénouement itself, in which the boomerang of envenomed rapier and cup lofted by Claudius destroys him.

Let us also consider, before examining Rouse 2, one other dramaturgical device in *Hamlet*: what may be called a doomsday[11] motif in Act V. Although scholars have discussed the allusions to the Last Judgment in *Lear* and in *Macbeth*, they have said very little about the references to it in *Hamlet*.[12] Yet the latter work uses the word *doomsday* more often than does any other Shakespearean drama.[13] Furthermore, we must not ignore the traditional Day of Judgment play of the mystery cycles, a play in which Elizabethans had heard the trumpet of doom and had seen the good and the bad rising from their graves. In the four surviving cycles, trumpets of doom are blown repeatedly in the Chester and York versions of the Last Judgment and probably were used in the Towneley one as well.[14] Mystery plays continued to be performed in many places in England well into the reign of Elizabeth and the life of Shakespeare; for example, as late as 1580 they were given at Coventry, near Stratford.[15]

In the graveyard scene in Act V, we are reminded of doomsday several times. At the very beginning, we see an open grave and two diggers. Soon, while Hamlet and Horatio are entering, the older digger answers his own riddle as to who builds stronger than the mason, the shipwright, and the carpenter: "Say 'a grave-maker': the houses he makes lasts till doomsday" (V.i.58-59). Shortly thereafter, this digger and Hamlet pun on *quick* and *dead* when discussing the grave (V.i.124-29). Later, following the entry of Ophelia's funeral procession, the priest tells Laertes that his sister "should in ground unsanctified been lodg'd/ Till the last trumpet" (V.i.229-30). Laertes lashes back: "I tell thee, churlish priest,/ A minist'ring angel shall my sister be/ When thou liest howling" (V.i.240-42). Soon Laertes leaps into the grave, takes Ophelia in his arms, and shouts, "Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead" (V.i.251). Thus, throughout the scene we have been readied for experiencing some sort of Judgment Day.

We now turn to Rouse 2 in the final scene of *Hamlet*. It is introduced differently than was Rouse 1 in the first act. Then, we were momentarily surprised by the sound effect and were encouraged to associate it with the ghost. Now, instead, Claudius tells us about Rouse 2 shortly before it occurs during the fencing match. When we hear it, our response is to be twofold. Because of the loudness, similarity, and uniqueness of the two rouses, we should recollect Rouse 1, then the ghost and its insistence upon revenge. But we also should perceive Rouse 2 as a signal of imminent divine justice, of providential retribution about to take place in a manner unforeseeable either to Claudius and Hamlet or to ourselves. We have been prepared for this latter response in the various ways already described: by the cosmological reverberations from the cannonading, by the several couplings of *heaven* and *earth* throughout the play, by the repeated imagery of backfiring ordnance, by Hamlet's references to providence when talking to Horatio in Act V, and by the doomsday aura of the graveyard scene.

Just before the fencing match starts, Claudius describes the rouse to be given if Hamlet scores a hit against Laertes: "And let the kettle to the trumpet

speak,/ The trumpet to the cannoneer without,/ The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth,/ 'Now the King drinks to Hamlet' " (V.ii.275-78). Two lines later, the match begins:

Ham. Come on, sir.
Laer. Come, my lord.

[*They play and Hamlet scores a hit.*]

Ham. One.
Laer. No.
Ham. Judgment. (V.ii.280)

"Judgment" is Hamlet's last utterance before Rouse 2 is heard three lines later. To all the characters present, including Hamlet, the word is merely a request to Osric and the other "judges" (V.ii.279) for a call. But to us in the audience, conditioned for some sort of heavenly response, the demand "Judgment" should assume a second and more awesome meaning.[16] And this meaning is at once reinforced by Rouse 2, in which the kettledrum, trumpets, and cannon become for us a herald of doom. While the rouse is sounding to celebrate the hit, Hamlet is offered the poisoned cup but sets it aside. At this very moment we are to realize not only that Claudius' murderous plans have gone awry but that a higher power is now manifesting itself and that vengeance, demanded of Hamlet by the ghost earlier in the play, is about to be wondrously fulfilled.

NOTES

[1] Many contemporary commentators have this view of *Hamlet*. Among them are Bertram Joseph, *Conscience and the King* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1953), pp. 150-51; John Holloway, *The Story of the Night* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1961), pp. 35-36; Roland M. Frye, *Shakespeare and Christian Doctrine* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 231-32; *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1973; revision of 1951 Hardin Craig edition), p. 902; and Frank Kermode in his introduction to *Hamlet* in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), p. 1140.

[2] All quotations from Shakespeare's works are from *The Riverside Shakespeare*. For his text of *Hamlet*, Evans relies mainly upon the Second Quarto (1604/1605) and the First Folio (1623) and uses the former as his copy-text. For his choices between Q^2 and F^1 for specific lines, see his "Textual Notes" (pp. 1187, 1188, and 1196). All brackets in the quotations are those of Evans; in *Hamlet*, he often uses them to indicate his substitution of an F^1 word for a Q^2 one.

[3] In London theatre productions actual cannon, referred to in stage directions as "chambers," "pieces," or "ordnance," were fired. See Frances Ann Shirley, *Shakespeare's Use of Off-stage Sounds* (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1963), p. 60. Shirley (p. 4) describes them: "The cannon used by the theatre companies were the type of cast-iron chambers often fired in salute. They were without long barrels or carriages, and were loaded with blank

charges and fired on signal . . . . Burbage's men must have had more than one of the guns at the time of the Globe fire."

[4] Some examples of additional rouses are provided by Shirley, who states (p. 150) that both Frank Benson (1921) and Robert Atkins (1936-37) added a rouse in Act I just before Hamlet says to Horatio, "We'll teach you to drink [deep] ere you depart" (I.ii.175). She also notes (p. 167) that a rouse was added to the fifth act (V.ii.289) by J. P. Kemble (1814) and Henry Irving (1878).

[5] F. W. Sternfeld, in *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1963), pp. 212-13, discusses a similar use of two trumpet fanfares in *Othello* to emphasize the extent of Othello's deterioration between his arrival at Cyprus (II.i.177) and Lodovico's arrival there (IV.i.213). Also relevant to the rouses in *Hamlet* is the sound effect in *Henry VIII* (I.iv.49) of drum, trumpet, and ordnance that startles Anne Boleyn, Cardinal Wolsey, and others, and announces the entry a few lines later of the king and his courtiers as masquers.

[6] Thunder as a sound effect is discussed by Shirley. She stresses Shakespeare's use of it for witches and evil omens (pp. 113-15) but also notes its employment for the benevolent actions of Prospero and Ariel in *The Tempest* (p. 110).

[7] Three other examples are as follows: (1) Horatio describes the ghost to Marcellus and Bernardo as a "precurse of [fear'd] events" (I.i.121) that "heaven and earth together demonstrated" (I.i.124); (2) Hamlet, alone after the ghost's exit, exclaims, "O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?/ And shall I couple hell?" (I.v.92-93); and (3) Hamlet, deprecating himself to Ophelia, says, "What should such fellows as I do crawling between earth and heaven?" (III.i.126-28).

[8] In the Second Quarto—used as copy-text by most twentieth-century editions, including *The Riverside*—the ghost appears thirty-two lines after Rouse 1; in the First Folio only ten lines intervene. G. Wilson Knight, in his 1935 production, cut Hamlet's long speech in this passage but sees both rouses only as warnings to Hamlet. See his *Principles of Shakespearian Production* (London: Faber and Faber, 1936), pp. 156 and 172.

[9] Two other examples from the same scene are as follows: (1) Hamlet, referring to his use of his father's signet to seal the substitute letter to England, comments to Horatio, "Why, even in that was heaven ordinant" (V.ii.48); and (2) Hamlet, when asked by a lord if he is ready to fence with Laertes, replies, "I am constant to my purposes, they follow the King's pleasure. If his fitness speaks, mine is ready; now or whensoever, provided I be so able as now" (V.ii.200-02).

[10] This and the preceding example are cited by Maurice Charney in *Style in Hamlet* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 21-23. Two others given by him are as follows: (1) Claudius, fearing the consequences of Polonius' death, hopes that slander, "Whose whisper o'er the world's diameter,/ As level to the cannon to his blank,/ Transports his pois'ned shot, may miss

our name,/ And hit the woundless air" (IV.i.41-44) and (2) Claudius, describing his anxieties to Gertrude, exclaims, "O my dear Gertrude, this,/ Like to a murd'ring piece, in many places/ Gives me superfluous death" (IV.v. 94-96).

[11] The concept of the Last Judgment was well known to Elizabethans. Its principal scriptural source was and is the Book of Matthew, Chapters 24 and 25. The most frequent reference to it by Shakespeare and his contemporaries, however, probably was to the phrase "to judge the quick and the dead," which in *The Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England appeared both in the Nicene Creed (in Holy Communion) and in the Apostles' Creed (in Morning Prayer). Also, there were many pictures of doomsday, in which Christ appears as the presiding judge. Extant in English churches today, for example, are at least seventy-eight Judgment Day medieval wall-paintings; see A. Caiger-Smith, *English Medieval Mural Paintings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 31.

[12] For instance, Mary Lascelles, in her article "*King Lear* and Doomsday," *Shakespeare Survey*, 26 (1973), says that only in that play (V.vii.44-46) and in *Macbeth* (II.iii.77-79) is allusion to doomsday "intrinsic": "There remains . . . a wide divergence between these two Doomsday passages . . . and every other Shakesperian reference to the event" (p. 70). Other references she cites (p. 69) are in *Henry VI, Part I* (I.i.29-30), *Henry VI, Part II* (V.ii.40), and *Richard III* (I.iv.103-04); she does not mention any of those in *Hamlet.*

[13] The word *doomsday* appears three times in *Hamlet*: (1) Horatio, describing to Marcellus and Bernardo the eclipse of the moon before the assassination of Julius Caesar, says that "the moist star/ Upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands/ Was sick almost to doomsday" (I.i.118-20); (2) Hamlet, in response to Rosencrantz's statement that "the world's grown honest" (II.ii.237), comments sarcastically, "Then is doomsday near" (II.ii.238); and (3) one of the gravediggers explains to the other that what a gravedigger builds is strongest because "the houses he makes lasts till doomsday" (V.i.58-59). In addition, *doom* (meaning "doomsday") and "last trumpet" also are used: Hamlet, berating Gertrude for her relationship with Claudius, says, "Heaven's face does glow/ O'er this solidity and compound mass/ With heated visage, as against the doom" (III.iv.48-50); and the priest at Ophelia's funeral tells Laertes that without the command of Claudius "She should in ground unsanctified been lodg'd/ Till the last trumpet" (V.i.229-30).

[14] In the Chester Judgment Day play, angels prepare to blow their trumpets ("Beames") in line 33, the Blessed Pope ("Papa Saluatus") refers in line 46 to the "Bames blast" that has raised him, and a stage direction between lines 40 and 41 reads, "*Tunc Angeli Tubas accipient et flabunt.*" In the York play, angels are told to blow their trumpets ("bemys") in line 65, and references are made to "bemys" in line 63 and to "hydous horne" in line 115. What remains of the Towneley (sometimes called Wakefield) play is essentially the York text with additions. Because the beginning of the Towneley text is missing and the text starts at the equivalent of line 145 in the York version, we cannot be sure of the details in its opening incidents; but the use of trumpets seems likely. The *Ludus Coventriae* play contains no references to trumpets. See *The Chester Plays*, ed. Hermann Deimling, 2 vols., EETS (London: Oxford

Univ. Press, 1892, rpt. 1926 and 1959); *York Plays*, ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885); *The Towneley Plays*, eds. George England and Alfred W. Pollard, EETS (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1897); and *Ludus Coventriae, The Plaie Called Corpus Christi*, ed. K. S. Block, EETS (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1922, rpt. 1960).

[15] See Harold C. Gardiner, *Mysteries' End: An Investigation of the Last Days of the Medieval Religious Stage* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1946), p. 92, n. 143.

[16] The stage direction *"Trumpets the while"* (between V.ii.278 and 279), which appears in Q^2 but not in F^1, comes only one line before the fencing match and only five lines before Rouse 2. The coupling of *"Trumpets the while"* with Hamlet's request for "Judgment" in line 280 further readies us to identify Rouse 2 as a trump of doom.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 31-41
Vol. 56, No. 1

BRINGING SHAKESPEARE'S CHARACTERS DOWN TO EARTH: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KNEELING

John T. Onuska, Jr.*

There is far more to Shakespeare than what reaches the listener's ear or the reader's eye—a truism we all need to be reminded of from time to time. Shakespeare wrote for the stage, not the page. Because he was an actor and, no doubt, a director, his artistic conception inevitably took the shape of stage pictures composed of moving bodies; images that were fused with those other products of the mind forged by invisible words. Such stage business is everywhere in the text—explicitly and implicitly—between and within the dialogue; but all too often it goes unnoted—not only by students, but by their teachers, performers, directors, and, sad to say, even by editors.[1]

While detailed textual insertions spelling out internal stage directions are not to be wished for—what is obvious should be allowed to remain so—there is a remarkable degree of inconsistency when it comes to dealing with such matters editorially. Editors of Shakespeare are too often either careless or stage-blind. David Bevington concedes the problem: "In my view the cumulative editorial tradition providing our heretofore 'received' text of Shakespeare has been haphazard in the use of added stage directions; sometimes a kiss, or the giving of a letter or money, or kneeling, are indicated, and sometimes not." Bevington notes "significant" action, even if it is self-evident at times, but he sees the need to proceed with caution since even "careful" readers may disagree as to what actually occurs on stage.[2] Such textual sensitivity is not misspent energy. The less attention paid to such details, the more one loses sight of Shakespeare's genius for selecting not only *le bon mot* but *le bon geste* as well.

Set alongside his fellow dramatists, Shakespeare emerges as the best creator of stage business and the most prolific one. The kind I have in mind is not spelled out at the start of a scene (*Enter at one door*, etc.) or between speeches. Rather it is action that represents a natural extension of a character's line of thought. Some examples are in order:

> Up, cousin up, your heart is up, I know,
> Thus high at least, although your knee be low.
> (*R2* III.iii.194-95)
>
> Take this from this, if this be otherwise. (*Ham.* II.ii.156)
>
> O how this mother swells up toward my heart!
> *Hysterica passio*, down, thou climbing sorrow,
> Thy element's below. (*Lr.* II.iv.56-58)
>
> Look here, Iago,
> All my fond love thus do I blow to heaven. (*Oth.* III.iii.444-45)[3]

*Department of English, University of Missouri, St. Louis, Missouri 63121

In each excerpt specific action is called for from the speaker. But in three modern editions of the plays (*Riverside, Pelican*, and Bevington's), only the lines from *Richard II* and *Hamlet* have received an editor's glosses. Clearly the tendency is for one editor to follow another's lead.

As these examples demonstrate, Shakespeare lets his characters speak and act for him. There is none of the annoying intrusiveness of Shaw or O'Neill, who assume the duties of stage designer and director and vocal coach in their stage directions. The reader of their plays is provided with a running commentary, at times verging on a critical essay, that is denied the theatergoer. Shakespeare also tells the actor what to do—how to move, how to speak, how to gesture—and when to do so. But as often as not, he provides such directions almost invisibly.

More telling than the amount of stage business is the kind one discovers. Indeed, each generation might be said to rely on certain pieces of stage business that serve as a sort of identifying cultural benchmarks. So the heroines of Greek tragedy invariably mourn by undoing their hair; Noel Coward's witty camp constantly light up cigarettes; Falstaff's cup of sack becomes Ernest/Algernon's cup of tea, and Blanche du Bois' lemon cokes yield to George and Martha's bourbon. The current stage fad is simulated sex, with or without nudity, though the Romans anticipated and outdid us in this respect in their spectacles.[4]

In the plays of the Tudor-Stuart period, one piece of stage business reappears with considerable frequency: kneeling. It also represents a symbolic distillation of many of the period's values and concerns, and often it highlights some of a play's central thematic concerns. The OED defines *kneel* as "to fall on the knees or a knee." The ambiguity here foreshadows what one encounters in the plays, though the feudal rule of thumb was that one knelt on one knee in homage, on two in worship.[5] The gesture can signify worship or homage: a form of reverence or adoration; supplication: a prayer or petition, as for a pardon or a blessing; and submission. It can exalt or demean, be made with respect or humility or resentment. The common note in all kneeling, no matter what motivates it, is an admission of inferiority before a political or social or moral superior. It is an assertion of dependence. The physiological response mirrors the psychological one: "In the animal world, bodily attitudes are powerful means of communicating dominance or submission, the 'pecking order,' and in the spectrum of human relationships 'respect' (or lack of it) is easily expressed by postural change."[6] The erect posture that signifies the self-sufficiency of a rational being is surrendered.

Thoughout history, kneeling has had a Janus-like identity. It has been used to show man's dual dependence on his supernatural and natural masters, and thus has a role in both religious and civic ceremony, public and private devotion. Ironically, it has been alternately encouraged and condemned as a proper form of human homage. The Greeks worshipped the gods on their knees; but the shipwrecked Odysseus also entrusted his fate to the good Phaecian queen: "He threw his great hands round Arete's knees."[7] Diocletian adopted the Persian custom of having subjects prostrate themselves before the emperor. This gave way to genuflecting before any imperial officer, a sign of homage appropriated by the feudal system and the emerging European monarchies. Probably because of its association with the veneration of pagan deities and living "divine" rulers, the primitive Church resisted the use of kneeling. But

by the fourteenth century, the simple bow accorded to a bishop or to a crucifix was replaced with genuflection. Civil ceremony had left its mark on religious ritual. Kneeling on both knees also assumed new significance. The early Christians followed the Jewish practice of reserving such kneeling almost exclusively for private prayer. Canon Law forbade its use in public prayer. It became the prescribed posture, though, of the *genuflectentes*, those penitents allowed to remain in church on their knees only until the Mass' Offertory. This set them off from the rest of the faithful who remained standing during public prayers. Not until the Renaissance was kneeling granted special status as *the* posture for public prayer and the reception of the eucharist.

The attitude toward kneeling had come full circle, or nearly so, for the debate was renewed by Protestant reformers who viewed kneeling as one more instance of papist corruption. While Luther was content to have communicants kneel, Zwingli wanted them seated; Calvin preferred standing. The 1552 revision of the first *Book of Common Prayer* (1549), while still requiring that one receive communion while kneeling, contained the Black Rubric which stated that kneeling in no way implied adoration of any Real Presence. Such a statement did not content those bent on purging all traces of Romanism. When the Elizabethan version of the Prayer Book appeared in 1559, however, this paragraph had been deleted. No doubt the Queen recognized that religious extremists posed a threat to her throne as well as to her church. Almost half a century later, her successor reportedly observed, "No bishop, no king." The shrewd Elizabeth may well have anticipated him by realizing that a refusal to kneel for communion was tantamount to refusing to bend before the Queen. The issue was the same: a subject's submission to his lord and master.[8]

Though Shakespeare takes no part in the ecclesiastical debate, he does show interest in the more far-reaching implications and the ambivalence of the gesture. He is only minimally concerned with the use of kneeling for spiritual purposes. We see very few characters on their knees in prayer. We hear Rosalind advise Phoebe to thank God on her knees for a good man's love (*AYL* III.v. 57-58); Beatrice assures Leonato that she gets on her knees to be spared a husband (*Ado* II.i.27-29).[9] What we do witness and remember, however, are the ironic uses of such kneeling. Titus and his daughter Lavinia pray to the seemingly deaf heavens (*Tit.* III.i.206-09). The Christian Othello vows to destroy his wife and her lover. The perversity of his unholy oath is underscored when Iago joins him on his knees (*Oth.* III.iii.460-69). Claudius cannot lift his thoughts to heaven although his knees have sunk to earth (*Ham.* III.iii.97-98). There is no correlation between the outward sign and the inner workings of the soul.

More often characters address their petitions not to a remote and perhaps heedless deity but to a visible authority figure, God's deputy on earth. Soon after Bolingbroke assumes the crown in *Richard II*, he must choose between two sets of kneeling petitioners: the Duke of York, and the Duke's wife and son Aumerle (V.iii.91-136). Similarly, in *King John*, Blanche and Constance plead at cross purposes before the French King about the wisdom of going to war with England (III.i.308-12). Leontes' lords urge him to spare his infant daughter (*WT* II.iii.149-56). Mariana spends a good bit of time on her knees in the final act of *Measure for Measure*; but it is Isabella's bending before the Duke that stuns the audience, once she resolves the internal debate between her desire for justifiable revenge and the need for mercy.[10] Most of these

petitioners are women, an indication perhaps of their greater willingness to swallow their pride before another human being. Such episodes lend support to the case for Shakespeare's authorship of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. In its first scene five women kneel before the Duke. The kneeling motif surfaces twice more, in I.iv and III.vi. Such pleading is usually successful. God's substitute on earth seasons justice with mercy. The afterimages left by such sequences are vivid. It is not mere coincidence, perhaps, that the only extant drawing which purports to be a contemporary illustration of a Shakespearean play, the "Henry Peacham" sketch in the Longleat Manuscript dated 1595, shows three characters on their knees in *Titus Andronicus*, most notably the Goth queen Tamora appealing to Titus for the pardoning of her son. Yet there is no explicit or implicit stage direction in the text suggesting that she kneels in I.i.

Not every character who kneels before a king or duke has a specific cause to plead. Some merely pay homage. This may happen as often as a servant or subject or ambassador comes into the presence of an authority figure, though such actions generally go unnoted in the text. But each occurrence visibly reasserts the principle of hierarchical ordering that is at the base of Tudor-Stuart society and all Shakespeare's plays. On occasion, this point is made by the absence of the gesture. When their servants fail to kneel before them, both Cleopatra and Katherine of Aragon interpret this as a sign of the lessening of their former authority (*Ant.* III.xiii.37-40; *H8* IV.ii.100-03). The lesson is driven home in *Richard II*. Bolingbroke assures Northumberland that he will go down on his knees before Richard (III.iii.31-38). But when the King appears on the walls of Flint Castle, we have what I believe to be the longest stage pause Shakespeare ever intended as Richard waits for a sign of fealty from his rebellious subjects:

> We are amaz'd, and thus long have we stood
> To watch the fearful bending of thy knee,
> Because we thought ourself thy lawful king;
> And if we be, how dare thy joints forget
> To pay their aweful duty to our presence? (III.iii.72-76)

It is not until some 110 lines later, after Richard has come down to Bolingbroke in the base court, that Bolingbroke's knee touches the earth (l.188). Richard sees the gesture for what it is, a sham:

> Fair cousin, you debase your princely knee
> To make the base earth proud with kissing it.
> Me rather had my heart might feel your love
> Than my unpleased eye see your courtesy.
> Up, cousin, up, your heart is up, I know,
> Thus high at least, although your knee be low. (III.iii.190-95)

He is echoing his uncle York who earlier rebuffed Bolingbroke's sign of respect as an empty display: "Show me thy humble heart, and not thy knee,/ Whose duty is deceivable and false" (II.iii.83-84).

Elsewhere as well Shakespeare calls attention to the darker side of obeisance. Such disparate characters as Ulysses, Iago, Hamlet, Richard II, and Apemantus all equate kneeling with sycophancy.[11] One by one Caesar's

assassins fall to their knees in mock petitioning and homage just before they stab him (*JC* III.i.33-76). Shakespeare makes much of the kneeling motif in the *Henry VI* plays to emphasize the chaos that has been loosed over England. Late in *Part II*, the king knights a kneeling supporter who has brought him the head of the rebel Jack Cade. This sets the stage for the squaring off between Henry and Richard. Somerset calls York a traitor and orders him to "kneel for grace" (V.i.108). The proud York says he will first consult his sons to learn "If they can brook I bow a knee to man" (l. 110). Clifford enters and kneels before the true and the would-be king. York misinterprets his action:

York. I thank thee, Clifford. Say, what news with thee?
Nay, do not fright us with an angry look.
We are thy sovereign, Clifford, kneel again;
For thy mistaking so, we pardon thee.

Clifford. This is my king, York, I do not mistake,
But thou mistakes me much to think I do. (ll. 125-30)

When Warwick and Salisbury enter, Henry quickly determines where their allegiance lies: "Why, Warwick, hath thy knee forgot to bow?/ Old Salisbury, shame to thy silver hair" (ll. 161-62).

The dilemma, to kneel or not to kneel, is foreshadowed earlier as Suffolk prepares to "stoop to the block" rather than have "these knees bow to any/ Save to the God of heaven and to my king" (IV.i.125-26). There could hardly be a more orthodox apologia. The *Henry VI* plays are among Shakespeare's earliest. But the question of misapplied fealty appears again at the end of his career. Caliban offers to kneel to the drunken "god" who "bears celestial liquor" (*Tmp.* II.ii.117-18) and no doubt he does, here and later (III.ii.40). Whether or not Shakespeare intended for him to kneel before Prospero at the play's end when he promises to "seek for grace" (V.i.296), he has made a serious point in a ludicrous way: "Take but degree away, untune that string,/ And hark what discord follows" (*Tro.* I.iii.109-10).

While knee-service is regularly subscribed to as proper and due in the plays, certain characters minimize its importance. Posthumous will not allow the penitent Iachimo to bend before him; they are, after all, social equals (*Cym.* V.v.117). When the victorious Octavius urges Cleopatra to rise from her knees, he is only matching her move for move in the game of one-upmanship (*Ant.* V.ii.113-15). He must seem to be her equal for the present. The public display he wants must come in the streets of Rome, not inside an Egyptian monument. And one head of state does not kneel before another, or so he would have Cleopatra believe. The ironic byplay recalls the way Richard II toys with his outclassed cousin: "Up, cousin, up." Once Bolingbroke becomes king, he is more sincere than his predecessor as he tells his aunt not once but three times to get up from her knees (V.iii.92; 111; 129). In *Two Noble Kinsmen*, Theseus goes him one better: four times he tells the mourning women to rise (I.i.35; 54; 74; 205). That Bolingbroke is dealing with his aunt or the Duke with queens does not really explain why both rulers seem so uneasy with these displays of deference. The answer may come in *The Merchant of Venice*. Although Portia tells Shylock to go down before the Duke and beg for mercy, the Duke hastens to prevent him from doing so: "That thou shalt see the

difference of our spirit,/ I pardon thee thy life before thou ask it" (IV.i.368-69). Perhaps the key lies in the difference between bending to offer respectful homage and bending to beg. Is it simply that the latter smacks of groveling, and that in the Christian scheme of things such conduct is undeniably demeaning?

There are two other contexts in which Shakespeare reveals some ambivalence about kneeling. The twentieth-century reader who accepts that subjects are expected to kneel before their sovereigns will probably be less receptive to children kneeling before parents or wives before husbands, but to Shakespeare's audience, one logically followed from the other. Such domestic signs of deference merely duplicated what was expected at court, the recognition of the hierarchical chain. As Lawrence Stone notes, "both state and Church, for their own reasons, actively reinforced the preexistent patriarchy within the family, and there are signs that the power of the husband and father over the wife and the children was positively strengthened, making him a legalized petty tyrant within the home."[12] The need for submission and obedience to one's superiors was emphasized at all levels of society. Thus it was the custom for children "when at home to kneel before their parents to ask their blessing every morning, and even as adults on arrival at and departure from the home. This was a symbolic gesture of submission which John Donne believed to be unique in Europe" (Stone, p. 171). By the middle of the seventeenth century, symbolic acts of this sort were harder to come by. But Shakespeare's plays provide ample evidence that up to that time the practice was more honored in the observance than in the breach. The list of kneeling offspring is a sizable one: Lavinia and her brothers kneel before Titus (*Tit.* I.i.161; 369-71), Marina before both her parents (*Per.* V.i.213; V.iii.46), Juliet before Capulet (III.v. 158), and young Talbot before his father in *1 Henry VI* (IV.v.32). Ferdinand kneels before the father he thought had been drowned (*Tmp.* V.i.179-80), Laertes kneels before Polonius to receive his blessing prior to setting out for Paris (*Ham.* I.iii.57), and even the malformed Richard of Gloucester bends before his mother (*R3* II.ii.105-06). The solemnity of the most mystical scene in all Shakespeare is enhanced when Perdita kneels in front of the "statue" of her mother (*WT* V.iii.42-44; 119-20).[13] Surrogate parents also receive such homage, whether or not they merit it. Helena, confiding in the Countess who is her mother figure (*AWW* I.iii.192), and Cressida, beseeching her uncle Pandarus, are both on their knees (*Tro.* IV.ii.88-96). Only the enigmatic Joan of Arc refuses to kneel for her father's blessing (*1H6* V.iv.25-26). This accentuates the unnaturalness of this witch in man's clothing. She is the anomaly among Shakespeare's children who does not heed the law laid down by the Duke to Hermia in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: "To you your father should be as a god" (I.i.47).

Two scenes between parent and child contain the quintessential expressions of the special nature of this bond, while revealing the circumspectness with which Shakespeare approaches the subject of kneeling. After Coriolanus has turned his back on his homeland, and both Cominius and Menenius, Coriolanus' surrogate father, have failed to sway him, the final attempt to save Rome is undertaken by a band of three women—Coriolanus' mother, his wife and her friend—and his young son. When their embassy reaches the Volscian camp, however, the scene's focus narrows to the intimidating Volumnia and her son. Coriolanus' first action is instinctive: he kneels before his mother (V.iii.50), a move that underscores not his infantileness but his sense of proper filial duty.

The gesture does not come easy to one who loathed the idea of begging votes on his knees, a stagy tactic urged upon him by Volumnia (III.ii.75; 117-20). Here, as elsewhere, she is determined to control their meeting. To do so, in addition to calling upon her considerable persuasive verbal powers, she borrows the gesture that Cominius for sure (V.i.65) and, I think, Menenius as well used with Coriolanus, but to no avail: she kneels before Rome's former savior:

> O, stand up blest!
> Whilst with no softer cushion than the flint
> I kneel before thee, and unproperly
> Show duty as mistaken all this while
> Between the child and parent. (V.iii.52-56)

The action has its intended impact. Coriolanus is stunned by such unnatural behavior (ll. 56-57). Parents do not kneel before their children; this contradicts the order of creation. Although many editors indicate that he raises his mother at this point, the text suggests that she remains fixed to the earth and makes the other petitioners join her there:

> *Vol.* Your knee, sirrah.
>
> *Cor.* That's my brave boy!
>
> *Vol.* Even he, your wife, this lady, and myself
> Are suitors to you. (ll. 75-78)

At some later point, however, she must rise because when her oral appeal fails, she again falls to her knees:

> He turns away.
> Down, ladies; let us shame him with our knees.
> To his surname Coriolanus 'longs more pride
> Than pity to our prayers. Down! an end,
> This is the last. So, we will home to Rome,
> And die among our neighbors.—Nay, behold 's!
> This boy, that cannot tell what he would have,
> But kneels and holds up hands for fellowship,
> Does reason our petition with more strength
> Than thou hast to deny 't.—Come, let us go. (ll. 168-77)

Only now does she make a move to leave, with a parting taunt on her lips (ll. 178-80). The confrontation is more than Coriolanus can endure. Finally, he breaks:

> O mother, mother!
> What have you done? Behold, the heavens do ope,
> The gods look down, and this unnatural scene
> They laugh at. (ll. 182-85)

Volumnia's victory does not signal the defeat of her son. On the contrary, it marks his rise. In the next scene, Menenius claims that Coriolanus has "grown from man to dragon. . . , He wants nothing of good but eternity and a heaven to throne in" (V.iv.13-24). The assessment is striking but mistaken. For the Coriolanus we have just seen is neither a monster nor a demigod nor a cowering child but a man.

This episode is echoed in *King Lear*. When Regan suggests that her father ask forgiveness from Goneril, Lear carries on like the decrepit, senile old man that he is not:

> "Dear daughter, I confess that I am old;
> Age is unnecessary. On my knees I beg
> That you'll vouchsafe me raiment, bed, and food."(II.iv.154-56)

Regan brands this act, quite correctly, as "unsightly tricks" (l. 157). Yet this grotesque charade provides an ironic gloss on the later scene where the broken Lear awakens from sleep and begins to orient himself to his new surroundings. What he sees is a young woman on her knees beside his litter, waiting for his blessing. As moving as this picture is, it is the next gesture—as reported by Cordelia—that jolts us: "No, sir, you must not kneel" (IV.vii.58). Through the haze of his storm-beaten mind, Lear recognizes the daughter he has wronged, and he attempts to beg her forgiveness on his knees. Cordelia will not tolerate such an act. Here, as always, she knows her place.[14] Later, when they have been taken captive, Lear promises to kneel before her in their prison and beg her pardon (V.iii.10-11). This time Cordelia says nothing; given the mental state to which he has reverted, there is no point in correcting him. Lear fulfills his wish as he kneels over her corpse minutes later. There is no attempt by the onlookers to draw him back, for in this upside-down world, there no longer is any hierarchy that must be observed. There is only horror.

While Shakespeare accepted the precept that a child owed homage to the parent, there is less reason to suppose that he believed wives owed a similar deference to their husbands, at least to the extent of making a symbolic display of it. Stone examines the inferior status of women in Tudor-Stuart England, but he makes no mention of wives kneeling before husbands. In Shakespeare's plays there are occasions when they do, but the circumstances suggest his dramatic intent. Katherine of Aragon argues for Buckingham's life before Henry, but she does so because he is her king, not merely her husband; and Henry tells her to rise (*H8* I.ii.9-10). Desdemona gets on her knees to learn from Othello why he is treating her like a whore (IV.ii.31). This action underscores her frailty and immaturity as much as any wifely devotion. This Desdemona is only a slight remove from the dutiful, naive daughter Brabantio once knew. When Calpurnia begs Caesar not to go to the Capitol, her imperious husband—quite in character—does not bid her to rise (II.ii.54). Yet when Portia starts to kneel before Brutus to draw from him the reasons that disturb his sleep, he stops her (II.i.270-78). Theirs is a marriage of equals. Shakespeare also shows his approval of a marriage of true minds in *The Taming of the Shrew*. At the close of the play Kate scolds those wives who "offer war where they should kneel for peace" (V.ii.162). She completes her lecture by placing her hand beneath Petruchio's foot, something that must be done while she is kneeling. Is this another of Shakespeare's endorsements of the Elizabethan

patriarchal system? Kate's lip service to the code or her audacious gamble? If so, she wins. Petruchio does not clamp his foot down in mastery. He raises her to his level for a kiss.[15]

Shakespeare appears equally reluctant to let unwed lovers kneel before one another. Richard the Crookback does while baring his breast to receive a swordthrust from the woman he is seducing (*R3* I.ii.173-78). But his affection for Anne is a lie. There is no evidence of any kneeling by more genuine lovers like Romeo and Juliet, Perdita and Florizel, or Ferdinand and Miranda. Shakespeare may have been reluctant to portray them as idolaters.[16] Unlike these ingenues, Cleopatra uses every female wile to maintain her hold on Antony. When she pulls her ships out of battle, the wordy queen wins back her defeated, despondent general by remaining almost mute ("O, my pardon! . . . Pardon, pardon!" [III.xi.61; 68]), and by shedding at least one tear. But does she kneel before the seated Antony? I think not. To do so would be totally out of character, an admission of inferiority and, if anything, she is Antony's and any man's peer. She will later kneel before Caesar to buy the time she needs. But she will only kneel by Antony when he is dead—and then she kneels over him, not below him (IV.xv.59-68).

The other dramatists of the period use stage kneeling in much the same circumstances as Shakespeare does. But even considering the statistical skewing that results from having more of Shakespeare's work than anyone else's, Shakespeare does make more frequent use of kneeling than his contemporaries do. And few come close to achieving his theatrical effects. The Duchess of Malfi dies kneeling while her assailants pull the cord around her neck, but such tableaux are rare outside Shakespeare. Yet while the characters who kneel in the non-Shakespearean dramas are familiar—subjects, children, parents, wives—at times the handling of the episodes is quite different. When the mother who has acted as a bawd for her daughter kneels in penance before her sons in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, they make no attempt to prevent her. In *A Woman Killed With Kindness, The Maid's Tragedy* and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* the wives who kneel before their husbands are all guilty of adultery. Lovers, in a number of plays, do kneel before one another, including the incestuous siblings in *'Tis Pity*, and the grotesque De Flores and the beautiful woman who has hired him to be her assassin in *The Changeling*.

We cannot state for certain why Shakespeare never created similar scenes. Did he find them philosophically or morally repugnant? Did they smack too much of sensationalism for his taste? We are on firmer ground when it comes to dealing with scenes he did write. Quite obviously Shakespeare was not interested in the ecclesiastical debate centered on kneeling for communion, but he did recognize the drama inherent in the act of kneeling itself. An analysis of the moments when his characters kneel may give us some insight into the way Shakespeare thought. It definitely will give us a keener appreciation of how he shaped his plays thematically, in physical as well as verbal terms. To read Shakespeare without visualizing his stagecraft is to see him with one eye closed.

NOTES

[1] In *How Shakespeare Spent the Day* (London: The Bodley Head Ltd., 1963), Ivor Brown argues that while Shakespeare probably did direct his

own plays on occasion, stage directions contained within the dialogue "were pointers not only for the player but for the director, whoever he was, to see that the desired effect was realised by the actor" (p. 101).

[2] *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 3rd ed. (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1980), Preface (n. pag.).

[3] All citations from Shakespeare and line numbers given in this paper are from *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974).

[4] *Historia Augusta*, cited in E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1903), I, 4, n. 4.

[5] Whether a character kneels on one knee or two is often but not always clear from the text. I have not called attention to this distinction in this paper.

[6] *A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, ed. J. G. Davies (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 316.

[7] *The Odyssey*, trans. Robert Fitzgerald (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1963), bk. VII (p. 115).

[8] The debate continued throughout Elizabeth's reign. The Puritan author of *A Second Admonition to the Parliament* (1572) expressed his objection to kneeling more humorously than most: "For thoughe they have manye guises, nowe to knele, and now to stande, these be of course, and not of any pricke of conscience, or piercing of the heart most commonly. One he kneeleth on his knees, and this way he loketh, and that way he loketh, another he kneeleth him selfe a sleepe, another kneeleth with such devotion, that he is so farre in talke, that he forgetteth to arise till his knee ake, or his talke endeth, or service is done." Cited in *Puritan Manifestoes*, ed. W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas (n.p.: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907), p. 115. The illustrations in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* may also provide a clue as to how some Elizabethan Protestants regarded kneeling. While there is a drawing of the Protestant martyr John Philpot on his knees in prayer, far more striking are the woodcuts of the Marian Bishop Edmund Bonner flogging one of his kneeling prisoners in the episcopal orchard and of Henry VIII placing his foot on the Pope's neck.

[9] There are relatively few uses of kneeling in the comedies, especially compared to the frequency with which it figures in the histories, tragedies, and romances.

[10] Lucio urges the postulant Isabella to kneel before Angelo (I.iv.79-83; II.ii.43-44), and very likely she does. Yet when her brother asks her to offer her body for his life, Isabella spurns his suggestion: "Die, perish! Might but my bending down/ Reprieve thee from thy fate, it should proceed" (III.i.143-44).

[11] *Tro.* III.iii.48; *Oth.* I.i.45; *Ham.* III.ii.61; *R2* IV.i.165; *Tim.* IV.iii. 211.

[12] Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 7.

[13] In *WT* V.ii.76 we learn that Perdita also knelt before her father when they were reunited.

[14] A number of details in this scene are echoed in *Pericles* V.i where the reclining king slowly comes to a recognition of his long lost daughter, Marina. Harold Jenkins uses the child-parent kneeling motif to support the case for Shakespeare's authorship of *Sir Thomas More. A Supplement to Sir Walter Greg's Edition of Sir Thomas More*, reprinted in *Collections. The Malone Society* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961-62), VI, 184.

[15] With the exception of Othello, who bends over the body of the murdered Desdemona for one last kiss, no husband in any of the plays kneels before his wife.

[16] In *Shakespearean Romance* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1972), Howard Felperin underscores my point: "Ferdinand is to be purged of the Caliban within, of the impulse to bow down in idolatry at the first sight of Miranda" (p. 265). But Desdemona kneels before the husband she sees as a demigod. Significantly, there is no mention of kneeling in any of the sonnets.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 43-48
Vol. 56, No. 1

CATALOGUE-INDEX TO PRODUCTIONS OF THE SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL/ROYAL SHAKESPEARE THEATRE 1879 - 1978

Michael Mullin*

The recently completed catalogue-index to productions of the Shakespeare Memorial/Royal Shakespeare Theatre (and the Shakespeare Centre archives which it describes) provides a new and useful research tool for scholars investigating the interpretation of Shakespeare's plays in the theatre. More specifically, for scholars and critics studying Shakespeare, it provides a means of examining the actors' interpretations during the century of productions at Stratford from 1879 to 1978.[1]

The Shakespeare Centre archives contain the complete production records of the Stratford theatre, which has grown from modest beginnings as a provincial center in the last century into the preeminent theatre for Shakespeare in the world today. These rich archival materials, comprising promptbooks, newspaper reviews, programs, and photographs, constitute what is probably the single most important collection documenting Shakespeare in the modern theatre. Previously available only through direct inspection at the Shakespeare Centre Library in Stratford-upon-Avon, these documents have been microfilmed by the University of Illinois Library and by Rank Xerox, thereby making it possible for scholars to obtain copies for use elsewhere. To request microfilm copies of specific materials, one should apply to the Librarian at the Shakespeare Centre.

The catalogue-index facilitates the use of this vast body of research materials. Made with the aid of the computer, the catalogue and derivative indexes supply basic information on all productions (1,201 in number), not only at Stratford-upon-Avon but also on those productions staged by the company elsewhere—in England or on world tours. The catalogue lists each production (both Shakespearian and non-Shakespearian) by play title, and then supplies the date of the opening night, the playwright, the theatre, the director, the lighting designer, actors and roles, and a list of reviews and (when known) the reviewers. Separate indexes to playwrights, to theatre personnel, and to reviewers cross-reference this information in alphabetical order by surname. The calendar at the end lists productions year-by-year. Using the catalogue, one may determine not only what was done, but also who did it, when, and who reviewed it. Using the indexes, one may trace the careers of playwrights, directors, designers, actors, and reviewers over the years at Stratford. Copies of the computer print-outs may be consulted at the University of Illinois Library; the catalogue and indexes have recently been published as *Theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon*.[2]

A look at a typical entry will indicate how the catalogue works. Plays are arranged alphabetically by title, and where there has been more than one production of a given play, these are ordered by date. Each production is assigned a catalogue number. The full entry for the production of *Antony*

*Department of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801

and Cleopatra directed by Glen Byam Shaw in 1953, and starring Michael Redgrave and Peggy Ashcroft, is as follows:

0030 Antony and Cleopatra 04-28-1953
Director(s): Shaw, Glen Byam
Designer(s): Motley
Light Design: Streuli, Peter
Theatre(s): Shakespeare Memorial Theatre
Shattuck: 43

Actors:	Andrews, Harry	Domitius Enobarbus
	Ashcroft, Peggy	Cleopatra
	Britton, Tony	Sextus Pompeius
	Eccles, Donald	Maecenas
	Goring, Marius	Octavius Caesar
	Kempson, Rachel	Octavia
	Morant, Philip	Candidus
	Peacock, William	Thidias
	Pleasence, Donald	Lepidus
	Redgrave, Michael	Antony
	Shaw, Robert	Dolabella
	Thomas, Powys	Proculeius
	Warre, Michael	Menas
	Watson, Mary	Iras
	Wilson, Jean	Charmian
Reviews:	Times	04-29-1953
	Evening Standard	04-29-1953 Shulman, Milton
	Evening News	04-29-1953
	Daily Mail	04-29-1953 Wilson, Cecil
	Daily Telegraph	04-29-1953 Darlington, W. A.
	Daily Express	04-29-1953 Barber, John
	Daily Worker	04-29-1953
	Birmingham Post	04-29-1953
	News Chronicle	04-29-1953 Dent, Alan
	Birmingham Mail	04-29-1953
	Coventry Evening Telegraph	04-29-1953
	Birmingham Dispatch	04-29-1953 Holbrook, Norman
	Birmingham Gazette	04-29-1953 Harvey, Brian
	Guardian	04-30-1953 Hope-Wallace, Philip
	Scotsman	04-30-1953
	Stage	04-30-1953
	Nottingham Guardian	04-30-1953
	Western Daily Press	04-30-1953
	Stratford-upon-Avon Herald	05-01-1953 Ellis, Ruth
	Coventry Standard	05-01-1953
	Warwick Advertiser	05-01-1953
	Leamington Spa Courier	05-01-1953
	Solihull & Warwick Co News	05-02-1953
	Sunday Times	05-03-1953 Hobson, Harold
	Observer	05-03-1953
	Morning Advertiser	05-06-1953 Tarran, Geoffrey

Sketch	05-06-1953	
Spectator	05-08-1953	
Times Weekly Edition	05-08-1953	
Time and Tide	05-08-1953	Hope-Wallace, Philip
New Statesman	05-09-1953	Worsley, T. C.
Tribune	05-09-1953	Findlater, Richard
Punch	05-13-1953	
Tatler	05-13-1953	Cookman, Anthony
Lady	05-14-1953	Trewin, J. C.
John O London	05-15-1953	Trewin, J. C.
Illustrated London News	05-16-1953	Trewin, J. C.
Queen	07-15-1953	
Evening Standard	11-04-1953	Conway, Harold
Financial Times	11-05-1953	
Birmingham Mail	11-05-1953	Westell, Claude L.
Daily Mail	11-05-1053	Wilson, Cecil
Yorkshire Post	11-06-1953	

Where archival information is lacking, entries obviously are omitted; i.e., productions lacking review notices or for which no credits for design or lighting were given.

The indexes provide cross-reference information. The playwrights, the theatre personnel (directors, designers, lighting designers, and actors), and the reviewers (with newspaper citation) are listed alphabetically in separate indexes. Throughout, the catalogue and the indexes rely on the authority of the Stratford archives, even when, in a few instances in the early decades, the archives seem to be at variance with published sources.

One shortcoming of using only the archival documents is that they can never be completely up to date, i.e., reviews of some of the most recent productions in 1978 could not be entered, as they had not yet been received by the Shakespeare Centre. After information was first entered from the microfilms at Illinois, the entire print-out was verified by the staff of the Shakespeare Centre Library. While we have striven for exactitude, those who have worked in theatre history will understand that the records themselves are not always accurate.

To use the catalogue and indexes effectively, they should be used together. Many questions about a given production can be answered by referring to the indexes. The 1953 *Antony and Cleopatra* again provides an example. What other plays did the director do, and when? The index shows that Glen Byam Shaw directed a dozen plays at Stratford in the fifties, and that *Antony* was one of the first. The design team, Motley, also worked with Shaw on most of his other productions. What were the other plays in Stratford that season? The calendar shows seven others. How experienced were the actors, especially those in the major roles: Peggy Ashcroft (Cleopatra), Michael Redgrave (Antony), Harry Andrews (Enobarbus), and Marius Goring (Octavius)? Entries for each of them show that Peggy Ashcroft, who continued to act at Stratford through the 1960s and 1970s, had in 1953 been seen on the Stratford stage previously only once. During the 1950 season she had played Cordelia and Beatrice. Redgrave, too, had not played often at Stratford, though his experience was nonetheless impressive. In 1951 he directed *Henry IV, Part 2,*

and in the same year he played Hotspur in *Henry IV, Part 1*, the Chorus in *Henry V*, Prospero in *The Tempest*, and the title role in *Richard II*. Harry Andrews claimed more than a dozen parts. Marius Goring, fewer, but still major ones such as Richard III in the 1953 season. Turning to the reviewers, some of whose names are doubtless yet familiar, we discover that, among dozens of reviews by W. A. Darlington, Harold Hobson, Philip Hope-Wallace, Milton Shulman, and J. C. Trewin, the 1953 *Antony and Cleopatra* was the first and in most cases the only production of the play they saw at Stratford. And the index to the playwrights suggests an explanation for this, as the play had not been often staged in the three previous decades. Before Glen Byam Shaw staged it in 1953, it had appeared three times in the 1920s, once in 1935, and once in 1945.

Having answered such questions, one may then turn to published sources: the histories of production at Stratford, the memoirs of theatre people, reviews in widely circulated newspapers such as *The Times* and the *Sunday Times*, and the annals of production in *Shakespeare Survey* and *Shakespeare Quarterly*.

For scholars and critics, of course, the archives hold a special interest. More and more we are turning to the knowledge of actual performance—whether through direct experience in the theatre or through imaginative reconstructions of past performances—to understand Shakespeare's plays and other dramatic literature. Too often both theatre historians and literary critics seeking to draw upon actual theatre experience have had to rely on documents studied in isolation: a single promptbook, a sheaf of reviews, some published memoirs. Using the catalogue-index and the archives, one can overcome such isolation, rediscovering the context in which director, designer, actors, and reviewers worked—that which was part of the theatre lore of the time, but which is otherwise lost to those who came later. The actor-manager Beerbohm Tree, to cite an example from London early in this century, was the whipping boy of Bernard Shaw and of the influential critic A. B. Walkley of *The Times*. For decades their scathing reviews of his productions were quoted as proof of Tree's ineptitude as an actor and director. New research using the Tree archives at the University of Bristol reveals, however, that Tree's box office was right.[3] His stagings satisfied nearly everyone *but* those prominent critics. As a result, a new understanding of his work now seems to be under way. By using the catalogue-index and the Stratford archives, one may reconstruct and interpret signal performances of the past, not in isolation but within the context of other productions of the same play and by their theatrical milieu.

While the Stratford record need not necessarily bring about such reversals of judgment as Tree's case seems to warrant, it does pose interesting questions for further investigation, which go beyond a particular play or the work of particular artists. How, for instance, has William Poel's notion of "Elizabethan staging" in fact influenced Shakespearian production? Long after his own trial runs at Stratford, Poel's ideas reappeared in Iden Payne's experiments, and still later in attempts by such designers as Motley to achieve the continuity of action which Poel established as the authentic dynamic of a Shakespeare play. One might trace a particular play through its various stagings, and thereby discover a cross-section of its possibilities, as it moved from the fixed scenes of the early years to the fluid action of later productions. So too, it would reward literary critics to study productions based upon particular

critical concepts, a common phenomenon of the sixties and seventies, and to compare them with earlier productions or with variations on other critical themes. Jan Kott's much read *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, for instance, provides a central source of inspiration. A thorough analysis and evaluation of such "conceptual" stagings enrich our understanding of the interplay between critical insight and stage realities. Similarly, studies in imagery, now in academic eclipse, might usefully explain the design, lighting, and stage blocking in a production. Since staging responds in concrete terms to the text, it must surely be seen to realize some "dramatic" images (to use Alan Downer's term), while in effect subordinating other "literary" images. Studies of the plays' psychological substrata, which are often open to the charge that they are interesting but only speculative, might well be grounded on the realities of actual staging. So, too, could be the researches of historians, whose speculations on hypothetical Elizabethan stagings might find confirmation (or denial) in the accumulated stage practice at Stratford. Where a supposed effect of stage movement recurs again and again under a variety of stagings, one may argue with conviction that it is built into Shakespeare's script. Where it does not, the burden of proof falls upon the investigator to show that such results could occur only on Shakespeare's original stage. In these ways, and in others which will readily come to mind, speculations on the play's meaning may find verification (or its absence) in the actualities of real performance over the years in Stratford. Besides these strictly Shakespearean problems, of course, scholars whose interest lies primarily in non-Shakespearean drama will find appropriate opportunities for similar investigation. For what is true of Shakespeare in the theatre also holds for other playwrights.

I hope that the productions recorded in the Shakespeare Centre archives and now made more accessible through the catalogue-index will enable today's Shakespeareans to draw upon the extensive experience embodied in the Stratford production record. Through this record, the directors, designers, and actors who will make today's theatre, no less than the scholars and critics who will influence today's audiences, may draw upon this common store of theatre experience. Besides the vast body of factual information, there is much wisdom in the Stratford theatre archives, as well as, lest anyone should forget, much of the daring, excitement, and the joy of discovery that is theatre, especially the theatre of Shakespeare.

NOTES

[1] Thanks are due to those who have made the project possible. Dr. Levi Fox, Director of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, generously supported the project from its inception in 1974 to its completion last year. Marian Pringle, senior librarian at the Shakespeare Centre, and her colleagues, Miss Eileen Robinson and Miss Mary White, supervised the microfilming of the promptbooks and theatre records and then checked the computer print-out with meticulous care, patience, and good humor.

[2] *Theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon: A Catalogue-Index to Productions of the Shakespeare Memorial/Royal Shakespeare Company, 1879-1978*, 2 vols. (Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1980); in the United

Kingdom, distributed by the Library Association, 7 Ridgmount Street, London, WC1E 7AE.

[3] For details, see my article "Strange Images of Death: Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree's *Macbeth*, 1911," *Theatre Survey*, 1976, pp. 125-42.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 49-56
Vol. 56, No. 1

THE SHAPE OF THE SUPERNATURAL: FUSELI ON SHAKESPEARE

Anita J. Schaefer*

In the sense that Keats identifies Shakespeare's universality in terms of the artist's aesthetic distance, so it must be noted that the negative capability that produced his universal characters and conflicts has also become progenitor of myriad pictorial illustrations. Shakespeare's works have inspired both traditional and interpretive graphics, both imitative and esemplastic, as diversified in mode as their craftsmen.

Most subjects of the illustrations are usually scenes from the plays rather than icon or landscape, each painting or sketch taking the shape of a moment in that scene, a moment transfixed in a behavioral pose of the principals characterized by highly individualized emendations. The "moment" frequently conveys a predominant theme, the mise-en-scène becoming the counterpart of the message signaled through dialogue and movement.

Shakespeare's themes have been done in many varieties of expression from oil paintings to caricatures, in almost every mode from neo-classicism to contemporary realism, and in almost every attitude from mystical to modern, from William Blake to Peter Blake.

In particular the common nocturnal theme that pervades Shakespeare's plays has been motif for numerous pictorial works, many of which are extremely inventive and only secondarily indicative of the script. Of course, the Shakespearean nocturnal, coupled with preternatural themes, would lend itself to interpretations beyond mimesis, and it is this composite, supernatural focus, with its multitude of possible manners and moods, that can illustrate the vastness of the universal inspiration and appeal of Shakespeare.

If one were to cite the painter hero who embodies the creative force of Shakespeare's influence, he should name the Swiss romantic Johann Heinrich Füssli, generally referred to as Henry Fuseli, an artist whose interest in and interpretations of the Shakespearean supernatural in singular extravagance and caprice are well known.

When Fuseli was commissioned, along with more than thirty other painters, to contribute works to Alderman John Boydell's scheme, the Shakespeare Gallery, Fuseli chose mostly those scenes characterized by their supernatural potential. Even though Boydell admitted in his preface to the 1789 catalog of the Gallery that not even a combination of Michelangelo and Raphael could really interpret Shakespeare pictorially,[1] history proves that artists, including those in Boydell's enterprise, must have thought differently. In Fuseli's case the inspiration started long before the Boydell plans and continued far beyond the Gallery contributions.

Fuseli's perpetual fascination with the supernatural is evident in many bizarre and novel paintings, the night phantasms and accompanying superstitions of Shakespeare's plays having been a central stimulus. The dream condition associated with apparitions, hallucinations, trances, visions, and related, comic

*Department of English, Southwest Missouri State Univ., Springfield, MO 65802

grotesqueness or beauty of character charmed Fuseli to do many sensational interpretations of Shakespeare's fairies and ghosts. In this context Fuseli translates the Elizabethan/Jacobean mood into another and invents an imaginative, somnambulate world of nightmare and impulse, passion and parody. Certainly his figures from *The Tempest, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Macbeth, Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet* can denote the reaches of the Shakespearean influence.

The setting and principals of *The Tempest*, for example, inspired the Fuseli painting of Act I, scene ii, the moment when Ariel exits on errand for Prospero. The play afforded the preternatural focus Fuseli was so often drawn to, the *ou topos*, or otherwhere, of a strange Mediterranean island, technically geographic but distinctly a dimension of magic and dream, good and evil. In his painting of the scene, engraved for the 1802 collection of Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery, Fuseli interpreted the perpetual tension between Prospero and Caliban expressed in the ara of threatening interchanges in which Prospero reveals his chief complaint, the constant remembrance of Caliban's unsuccessful intrusion on Miranda. Caliban's vehemence is based on the confinement and servitude inflicted upon him through the wizardry of Prospero. Annoyed with Prospero's demands, Caliban curses both Prospero and Miranda:

> As wicked dew as e'er my mother brushed
> With raven's feather from unwholesome fen
> Drop on you both! A southwest blow on ye
> And blister you all o'er! (I.ii.323-26)[2]

Aligned in power with the supernatural entity of the island, Prospero, as temporary Magus who can call up his own retaliatory forces, responds:

> For this, be sure, tonight thou shalt have cramps,
> Side-stitches that shall pen thy breath up. Urchins
> Shall, for that vast of night that they may work,
> All exercise on thee; thou shalt be pinched
> As thick as honeycomb, each pinch more stinging
> Than bees that made 'em. (I.ii.327-32)

Miranda, Prospero, and Ariel are depicted with a moody Caliban in a shadowy setting in front of a cave overlooking a surging sea. The conflict between good and evil is ultimately symbolized in the position of the two central subjects: Prospero, a tall, patriarchal "wicca" type holding a reed-like wand and pointing to Caliban who gestures in protest. The good that Shakespeare invests in Prospero and his white magic, and the evil manifest in Caliban's base activities set up the struggle suggested by Fuseli in the gestures of the extended arms. Prospero's lordship and dominance are obvious in the Fuseli figure, but Caliban is the definite center of the composition. The Fuselian portrayal of Caliban is consistent with both the popular concept of the genetic bestiality resulting in unholy alliance and with the standard allusion to the centaur persona such as Ovid's Nessus who tries to ravish Deianira. Caliban is painted as partly human, his physiognomy akin to the gothic, demonic beasts adorning Mont St. Michel or Notre Dame. In contradiction to many other visual delineations of Caliban, as well as to the literal ugliness suggested by Shakespeare, Fuseli's creature does not have the deformity of the "freckled

Plate 1. (Boydell Print) THE TEMPEST *ACT I. SCENE II.*

Plate 2. (Boydell Print) MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM *ACT IV. SCENE I.*

Plate 3. (Boydell Print) *MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM*

Plate 4 (Boydell Print) *MACBETH. ACT I. SCENE III.*

whelp, hagborn" (I.ii.284), one who was "got by the devil himself" (I.ii.321). Rather, Caliban has the sinewy anatomy so like many other Fuselian male figures, pictorial variations of the *Apollo Belvedere*. Evil in Fuseli's works is often not ugly at all; on the contrary, it is merely a distortion of beauty.

The shaft of light surrounding the departing Ariel draws attention to itself and alleviates the excessiveness of the horizontal plane created between the entended arms of Prospero and Caliban. Shakespeare's Ariel, whose gender and appearance have been subject to interpretations as special as W. Hamilton's lyre-playing Grecian woman, was no problem to Fuseli, who chose an androgynous, wingless cherub, barely resembling the spritely Shakespearean hamadryad who could become a water nymph or a harpy at will.

In treatment of magicalness, Fuseli enjoyed an even greater departure from the script of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, indulging in an artistic extravagance that compares to the mood and whim of J. R. Planché's productions for theatre. The painter chose Act IV, scene i of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, set where illusion and reality blur so much that Shakespeare's creatures of the woods take on an aspect so fantastic as to anticipate the whimsical freedoms of later surrealism in art. Fuseli's interpretations of the characters of Shakespeare's dream state might rightly be called specters in nightmare masques. The creatures are not Shakepearean characters but Fuselian inventions, a host of tiny background beings moving about while a peculiar group of modishly dressed females swirl around Titania who sits next to Bottom, the victim of Puck's affinity for totemism. The entire energy of the entourage compares minimally with the script and supersedes the play, becoming Fuseli's own partially beautiful, partially ghastly pseudoworld. Titania, in a ballet-like pose, and Bottom beside her are recognizable as Shakespeare's fairy queen and jackass lover; the remainder of the cluttered painting is a personalized version of a monster raid of fairies and assorted supernatural personae, typical of which are a nymphic child with a semi-developed moth's head, after Reynolds, a gnomic changeling, and new visions of Bottom's attendants. Mustardseed is a *Belvedere* derivative resembling Andrea del Sarto's executioner; Cobweb is almost indistinguishable in a corner as he attempts to take the honeybee. Fuseli contradicted himself as well in his painting *Cobweb*, for, in this instance, Cobweb is quite different—a diminutive, old man carrying a feather, typical fairy transportation, which could also serve as a broom for his spider webs. The even smaller personage in the foreground could be Mustardseed, emulating the stature implied in his name. Fuseli's Mab figure seated in the center may be Titania, but Bottom is defintely not a character in this rendition.

A similar Boydell work and two related paintings for Woodmason's *Shakespeare* also feature Titania attended by unique beings hardly the tiny Shakespearean elves who hide in acorn cups, wear bat-winged coats, or wrap up in snake skins. Puck, a central figure of the play in his tricksiness and service to the fairy king Oberon, is reduced to a shape in the background. In only one painting, a Boydell print, does Fuseli caputre the essence of the English-Welsh tradition tracing to Pookas and the Bucca fairy deity embodied in the Puck or Robin Goodfellow of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The Boydell print shows Puck as a bat-winged, curly-haired elf, wielding a whip-like wand as he hovers above a terrified horseman. Even though Puck is a bit more sinister here, he is, nevertheless, more like the play image of a mischief-making, spontaneous creature who enjoys teasing others. Ironically, Fuseli's Ariel is quite similar to

the cherubic Pucks fashioned by Reynolds, who was to some extent Fuseli's inspiration.

Fuseli's imagination, in other words, owed little allegiance to literary obligations in interpretations of supernatural themes. Fuseli deferred to fancy without much response to formulaic prescriptions suggested by texts. The painter's singular conception of the epiphanies in *Macbeth, Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet* are also as far from the obvious script as are his paintings of *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The manifestations of stylized phantoms together with characters who are haunted by them are, indeed, of a Fuselian interpretation. Fuseli's paintings of the witches in *Macbeth* depart in varying degrees from the lines the works intend to encompass, especially in a Boydell print of Act I, scene iii, for example. Banquo speaks:

> What are these
> So withered, and so wild in their attire,
> That look not like th' inhabitants o' the earth,
> And yet are on't? Live you, or are you aught
> That man may question? You seem to understand me,
> By each at once her choppy fingers laying
> Upon her skinny lips. You should be women,
> And yet your beards forbid me to interpret
> That you are so. (I.iii.39-47)

In Fuseli's painting the character of the sisters takes on histrionic interpretation—that notable Fuselian élan. Three hooded spirits occupy a semi-illumined fog, one beardless figure rising slightly above two other masculine-looking, long-haired creatures, faces animated. Rather than putting their chapped fingers to their lips, however, they point dramatically to Macbeth and Banquo standing on a garish heath in manneristic awe. Shakespeare calls the witches the weird sisters, sisters of fate, after Holinshed, but he includes the masculine beard that is part of the tradition associated with Scottish witches. He does not seem to be concerned with precision as such. Fuseli does not bother with distinction of gender, painting his figures as robed or caped beings, clean-shaven but masculine, less like occult illusions and more like an ethereal brotherhood.

Even in *Julius Caesar*, the ghost is changed. Fuseli's Brutus is a placid observer totally without apprehension as he faces one who is, according to Shakespeare, an evil spirit (IV.iii.279). When the ghost appears, Brutus says:

> Ha! Who comes here?
> I think it is the weakness of mine eyes
> That shapes this montrous apparition.
> It comes upon me. Art thou anything?
> Art thou some god, some angel, or some devil,
> Thou mak'st my blood cold, and my hair to stare?
> Speak to me what thou art. (IV.iii.272-78)

The only transmogrification evident in Fuseli's ghost is a fixed stare, a profound contrast to Shakespeare's terrifying visitor from the dead.

Fuseli does the ghost in *Hamlet* in a somewhat more convincing faithfulness to the mood of the script, but the shape is entirely real, the garment a

suit of armour matching Horatio's line that the ghost has the "war-like" form of Hamlet's father. The heavy nimbus surrounding the ghost announces the supernatural quality of the otherwise corporeal figure. Fuseli paints Marcellus, Barnardo, and Horatio in appropriate reaction, but the horror is overdone in the melodramatic poses like Sistine models of which Fuseli was so fond.[3]

In essence, with Fuseli, anything was allowable in his art; any notion could be shaped on canvas, the literary vehicle being medium for inspiration rather than imitation. His inventiveness overshadowed any dutiful attention to character in such plays as *The Tempest, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Macbeth, Julius Caesar,* and *Hamlet.*[4] Shakespeare's universal supernatural was a theme for a dimension beyond tradition or history. Fuseli's supernatural emerged with satirical arabesques, unconstrained parody, and colorful oxymorons, taking the shape of a new world of artistic drama characterized by a preferred poetic license.[5]

NOTES

[1] John Boydell, in "Preface," *Collection of Prints, from Pictures Painted for the Purpose of Illustrating the Dramatic Works of Shakespeare, by the Artists of Great-Britain* I (London: John and Josiah Boydell, 1803).

[2] All quotations are from *The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare*, ed. Sylvan Barnet (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972).

[3] See a detailed analysis of Fuseli's style in Peter Tomory, *The Life and Art of Henry Fuseli* (New York: Praeger, 1972).

[4] The works discussed are cataloged in three texts: *The Boydell Shakespeare Prints* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968); *Henry Fuseli: 1741-1825* (London: Tate Gallery, 1975); Peter Tomory, *The Life and Art of Henry Fuseli* (New York: Praeger, 1972). In order of discussion the works are: from *The Tempest* ACT I. SCENE II., pl. IV (Boydell); and W. Hamilton *TEMPEST,* pl. 1 (Boydell, third section of prints). *MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM* ACT IV, SCENE I., pl. XX (Boydell); and *Cobweb*, pl. 24 (Tate). Comparison, Boydell and two Woodmason prints, respectively: *Titania's Awakening*, pl. 28; *Oberon Squeezes the Flower on Titania's Eyelids*, pl. 25; and *Titania Awakes, Surrounded by Attendant Fairies, Clinging Rapturously to Bottom, Still Wearing the Ass's Head*, pl. 27 (Tate). (Puck) *MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM*, pl. 1 (Boydell, third section of prints). *MACBETH* ACT I. SCENE III., pl. XXXVII (Boydell). *Julius Caesar*, pl. 220 (Tomory). *HAMLET* ACT I. SCENE IV., pl. XLIV (Boydell).

[5] A valuable summary of the Fuselian form of invention is Paul Leonhard Ganz, *Die Berühmtesten Gemälde der Welt* (Bern: Hallwag, 1947), pl. 133.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The plates of the Boydell prints in this article have been reprinted by Benjamin Blom, Inc. and distributed by Arno Press Inc. The permission to reprint them here is gratefully acknowledged.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 57-65
Vol. 56, No. 1

"READING" THE PRINCE: SHAKESPEARE, WELLES, AND SOME ASPECTS OF *CHIMES AT MIDNIGHT*

Leland Poague*

The following remarks contribute to the growing body of commentary on the Orson Welles film *Chimes at Midnight*. Specifically, I will consider certain "textual" elements—in the Welles film and in the Lancaster plays of Shakespeare from which the film is adapted—which will help to determine our "reading" of the figure of Hal, the Prince of Wales.[1] In the process I shall attend both to large scale patterns of structure and theme and also to more specific elements of staging and mise-en-scène in order to explain how in my view the Welles Hal differs from Shakespeare's.

* * * * *

Central to the plays of Shakespeare's Henriad is a concern with the issue of political legitimacy—and especially with the conditions under which such legitimacy can be asserted or maintained. Those conditions seem far from stable in Shakespeare; critics are remarkably in agreement, for example, that the Henriad charts a shift from one ideological framework to another, a shift from what is essentially a medieval view of kingship to what is essentially a modern (or, perhaps, Renaissance) view of the role of "The Prince" in the affairs of the nation.[2] Curiously, however, the plays invoke a kind of dynastic double vision. There seems little likelihood that the "other Eden" eulogized by John of Gaunt in *Richard II* can ever be restored—not even by Richard.[3] Indeed, in throwing down his warder to stop the combat of Mowbray and Bolingbroke, Richard himself betrays a lack of faith in God's judgment and a corresponding willingness to resort to "policy" as a means to his personal ends. And yet it remains the case throughout the plays of the Henriad that the medieval view of kingship persists "as a view" long after it ceases to carry any genuinely ethical (as opposed to political) weight in the affairs of men.

In this context, then, it is especially striking how thoroughly Welles manages in *Chimes at Midnight* to downplay the ethical dimension of the dynastic quandary. Gone altogether, for example, are a number of substantial set-speeches wherein nobles—not always the king's enemies—recount the circumstances of Bolingbroke's usurpation of the throne. In *1 Henry IV*, V.i., for instance, Worcester defends himself to the King's face by recalling at length their previous friendship ("For you my staff of office did I break/ In Richard's time") and Bolingbroke's subsequently forgotten oath to "claim no further" than "the seat of Gaunt."[4] Welles retains the confrontation of Worcester and the King—but he gives Worcester only two lines, neither of which refers to Bolingbroke's previous duplicity. In *2 Henry IV*, III.i. it is King Henry himself, as he endeavors to read "the book of fate," who retells at length (though self-servingly) the tale of his usurpation of Richard's throne—even to the extent of repeating the very words wherein Richard prophesied

* Department of English, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

Northumberland's eventual treachery to Bolingbroke. All Welles retains of the scene is Bolingbroke's opening soliloquy on sleep; the politically specific lines are cut. Other such speeches deleted by Welles include those by Hotspur (*1 Henry IV*, IV.iii), the Archbishop of York (*2 Henry IV*, II,iii) and by Mowbray (*2 Henry IV*, IV.i).

Moreover, it is not merely the fact of usurpation which Welles downplays in *Chimes at Midnight*; in cutting down and re-ordering the Shakespearean text, Welles effectively eliminates certain key "iterative" images drawn from that system of biological and cosmological metaphors known as "The Elizabethan World Picture" against which in Shakespeare the act of dynastic usurpation is, at least in part, to be measured. Less than twenty-four lines in Welles, for example, make *any* reference, however glancing, to the "garden" metaphor which is so important to an understanding of Shakespeare's Henriad. Likewise, being of "royal blood" means little more in *Chimes at Midnight* than that Hal is Bolingbroke's son and heir; the "blood" concept is not applied in Welles to England as a whole.

Clearly the aspect of the dynastic theme which Welles most thoroughly reworks in *Chimes at Midnight*, however, involves the question of Bolingbroke's responsibility for the usurpation of the throne and the regicide of Richard. Welles puts the issue "on hold," as it were, so that neither we nor Hal are invited to focus on the measure of Bolingbroke's duplicity until late in the film. Indeed, there are only four references in *Chimes at Midnight* to the fact of Bolingbroke's usurpation of the crown, and only the last of the four comes close to specifying Bolingbroke's guilt.

The first mention of Bolingbroke's questionable claim to the throne comes from Holinshed rather than Shakespeare and is spoken in voice-over as the camera pans down from empty sky to a long shot of Windsor castle perched on the crest of a rocky outcropping:

> King Richard the Second was murdered, some say at the command of Duke Henry Bolingbroke, in Pomfret Castle on February the fourteenth, 1400. Before this, the Duke Henry had been crowned King, though the true heir to the realm was Edmund Mortimer, who was held prisoner by the Welsh rebels. The new King was not hasty to purchase his deliverance, and to prove this, Mortimer's cousins the Percies came to the King unto Windsor. There came Northumberland, his son Henry Percy, called Hotspur, and Worcester, whose purpose was ever to procure malice and set things in a broil.

Several aspects of this passage deserve comment. Most significantly, the order of events is jumbled sufficiently enough to call into some question any sense of a direct cause/effect relationship between Bolingbroke's coronation as Henry IV and Richard's death. Furthermore, though Bolingbroke's duplicity is hinted at in the somewhat sarcastic remark that he was "not hasty to purchase" the deliverance of Mortimer, the focus of the passage shifts from Bolingbroke's lack of haste to the motives of the Percies, and especially to Worcester, whose "purpose was ever to procure malice and set things in a broil."

The second mention of the Bolingbroke/Richard relationship comes in the scene immediately following the voice-over passage from Holinshed. In

dialogue drawn from *I Henry IV*, I.iii, Bolingbroke curtly refuses "to ransom home revolted Mortimer" and licenses Northumberland's departure with his son. In the anteroom, then, Worcester proposes—as best he can—to take up arms against the King, though without offering an explicit justification for doing so (as he does in Shakespeare). The task of justifying the revolt of the Percies is rather left almost entirely in *Chimes at Midnight* to Hotspur. His account of the basic dynastic facts (that Mortimer was proclaimed heir by Richard, that Worcester and Northumberland "Did gage them both in an unjust behalf. . .To put down Richard") is cursory, however, and is called somewhat into doubt by the frenetic quality of Hotspur's incessant movement—either away from the camera, so that his words seem to get lost in the dead air of the large hall, or along with the camera, which seems to struggle to track along with him as he rants and raves himself into a fit of braggadocio. Especially by contrast with the genuine dignity evidenced in Gielgud's performance as King Henry, Hotspur's appeal to history seems remarkably self-full and self-serving, as if he were supplying retrospective justification for a decision already taken (as the Holinshed passage, in fact, implies). The effect, once again, is to deflect our focus *away* from Bolingbroke.

The third scene of *Chimes at Midnight* which makes reference to Bolingbrokes's usurpation of the crown is the first scene (Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV*, III.ii) between Hal and his father, which takes place prior to the battle of Shrewsbury. At issue is Hal's loyalty and Bolingbroke's anxiety regarding Hal's "inordinate and low desires." Underlying the dramatic "action" of the scene in Shakespeare, however, is the dynastic question: Bolingbroke clearly sees Hal as Richard reincarnate, as if sent by God as punishment for Bolingbroke's usurpation. In *Chimes at Midnight*, however, Welles again shifts the context and focus of the Shakespearean scene. Bolingbroke begins, as in Shakespeare, wondering whether Hal's behavior is a "scourge" to "punish" his own "mistreadings." But the "mistreadings" in question are far less clearly specified in Welles than in Shakespeare. Granted, in berating Hal, Bolingbroke makes explicit reference to Richard and to Ravenspurgh ("As thou art to this hour was Richard then/ When I from France set foot at Ravenspurgh;/ And even as I was then is Percy now")—but lacking in Welles is Bolingbroke's lengthy recitation of his own actions and responsibilities in taking the crown. Shakespeare's Bolingbroke "stole all courtesy from heaven" and "dressed [him] self in such humility" that he "did pluck allegiance from men's hearts. . . Even in the presence of the crowned king" (50-54). In Welles, by contrast, Bolingbroke's focus is almost exclusively on Richard's actions in ambling "up and down with shallow jesters and rash bavin wits"—as if Richard had lost the throne entirely by his own actions with little if any help from Bolingbroke. Welles' Bolingbroke admits no more than that "Opinion. . .did help [him] to the crown"—and the language of the scene in Welles' version is largely drained of such references to divine-right kingship as would make the fact of usurpation itself a matter of ethical consequence.

The only really explicit reference in *Chimes at Midnight* to the whole complex of issues which attend upon Bolingbroke's usurpation comes, then, toward the conclusion of the film in the scene which ends with Bolingbroke's death (Shakespeare's *2 Henry IV*, IV.v). Again Bolingbroke fears for his son's loyalty, for he sees in Hal's loose behavior an image of the disorder which his own acts have loosed upon the kingdom ("Now, neighbor confines, purge you

of your scum. . .For the fifth Harry from curbed license plucks/ The muzzle of restraint"). Hal then begs his father's pardon and allays his suspicions by reporting his own quarrel with the crown, which he describes as an "enemy" for having "murdered" his father. At which point, then, Bolingbroke unburdens himself of his guilt in relatively unequivocal terms:

> God knows, my son,
> By what bypaths and indirect crooked ways
> I met this crown,
> For all my reign hath been but as a scene
> Acting that argument.

Ultimately, then, there is no question in Welles that Bolingbroke is guilty—at least in his own mind—of transgressions weighty enough to throw his kingdom into perpetual turmoil. The point to make, however, is that in Welles his admission has the force of a revelation, confirming something only hinted at before.

A second kind of "structural" or "thematic" change wrought by Welles on Shakespeare may be understood as a corollary of the degree to which Welles downplays the dynastic issues as he found them in the Henriad. As James L. Calderwood points out, the effect in Shakespeare of Bolingbroke's usurpation of the crown is to change the linguistic and dramatic status of the "name" of "King." Kingship is no longer a matter of an identity between signifier and signified but of disjunction or divorce. The cosmological metaphors which Richard II took seriously become "lies" when spoken by Bolingbroke. "If so, the king is not a participant in divinity," writes Calderwood, "but an actor in a secular role."[5] Ultimately, as I have already noted, Bolingbroke in Welles is exactly this sort of actor—a "pretender" to the throne. But the fact of his pretense is seldom born down on. Welles deletes, for example, the opening scene of *1 Henry IV* wherein Bolingbroke proposes somewhat hypocritically to give up civil war for the sake of a crusade to the holy land—also cut is Bolingbroke's use of "counterfeit" stand-ins on the field at Shrewsbury.

More important in the present context, however, is the degree to which Welles downplays the theatricality of Hal—even while retaining the "play extempore" of the tavern scene. Clearly the most important scene as far as Hal's status as dramatist is concerned in his famous first soliloquy (*1 Henry IV*, I.ii). I will consider the scene at some length presently. A number of other changes, however, can be cited here to demonstrate how thoroughly Welles in *Chimes at Midnight* has de-emphasized the theme of role-playing.

In Shakespeare's *1 Henry IV*, I.ii, for instance, it is Hal who asks of Falstaff "Where shall we take a purse tomorrow Jack?" (93). The question might well be understood rhetorically; but it can also be seen as a prologue to the Gads Hill plot hatched, it seems, sometime prior to the moment when Poins enters the scene, as if Hal and Poins were already in league with Gadshill so that Hal's subsequent refusal to go along on the robbery only serves as one more goad to Falstaff in their ongoing battle of wits. In Welles, by contrast, the "Take a purse?" question is asked by Poins, and Hal's refusal to go along seems quite genuine until Poins lets on that the robbery will be essentially in jest. A similar devaluation of Hal's status as a dramatist is evidenced by the fact that Welles dropped altogether the opening section of *1 Henry IV*, II.iv wherein

Hal proposes to "drive away the time" by catching Francis the drawer in a verbal crossfire—and missing also from the same scene is Hal's proposal to "play Percy" to Falstaff's "Dame Mortimer" (104-05). Similarly, after Hal defeats Hotspur he soliloquizes (more or less—thinking Falstaff dead) over Hotspur's body. In Shakespeare, though *not* in Welles, the soliloquy is strikingly self-serving and self-dramatizing:

> If thou wert sensible of courtesy,
> I should not make so dear a show of zeal.
> But let my favors hide thy mangled face;
> And, even in thy behalf, I'll thank myself
> For doing these fair rites of tenderness.
>
> (*1 Henry IV*, V.iv.93-97)

Welles, on the other hand, ends Hal's soliloquy on what seems a heartfelt compliment: "This earth that bears thee dead/ Bears not alive so stout a gentleman."

One further group of "thematic" changes deserves comment. The theme in question is that of "time." I have argued thus far that Welles' adaptation of the Shakespearean texts involves de-emphasizing both the dynastic theme and the role-playing theme. Put another way, when Hal ascends the throne in *Chimes at Midnight* it is *not* by virtue of an almost blasphemous desire for power of the sort which motivates his father or the Percies, nor is it because he has been particularly adroit in garnering the good opinion of peers or populace by means of self-dramatization at the expense of his East-cheap fellows. There is little need for Hal to dramatize his near-miraculous "reformation" because devine sanction is not perceived (however falsely) as a prerequisite for rule in the world of *Chimes at Midnight*. What ultimately gains Hal the throne is nothing more, though nothing less, than the passage of time and its inevitable human corollary—death.

The time theme is announced and made especially resonant by one of Welles' most drastic reorderings of the Shakespearean text—his placement of lines drawn from *2 Henry IV*, III.ii at the very beginning of the film. The opening image, indeed, is a long shot of Falstaff and Shallow moving painfully across a snow-covered field, through a stand of bare-limbed trees, as Shallow intones "Jesus, the days we have seen." The scene then continues as the two old men enter an empty building (Shallow's barn?) and seat themselves before a fire. Shallow wonders if Jane Nightwork is still alive. Falstaff replies that she is "old, old." Shallow rejoins: "Certain she's old, and had Robin Nightwork by old Nightwork before I came to Clement's Inn"—to which Shallow adds, almost as if it were a conclusion, "Jesus, the days that we have seen." As if to confirm Shallow's remark, Falstaff then speaks the line from which the film's title derives: "We have heard the chimes at midnight, Master Robert Shallow."

In the context of the film as a whole, Falstaff's line can be read in two ways—as referring both to youth and death—and in this duality lies the key to the essentially elegiac tone of the entire film. Put another way, the "lost garden" eulogized in *Chimes at Midnight* is *not* a lost political or cosmological order but is rather, and more simply, a youthful enthusiasm for existence. For Shallow the "chimes at midnight" recall "merry nights" spent cavorting "in the Windmill in Saint George's Field" (Windmill = brothel). For Falstaff "the

sweetest morsel of the night" is his relationship with Hal, by means of which Falstaff labors mightily to maintain a sense of his own youth and vigor—though at some level Falstaff seems well aware that he fights a losing battle ("How subject we old men are to this vice of lying"). Hotspur appears to be similarly motivated in *Chimes at Midnight*: in his "faint slumbers" he murmurs "tales of iron wars," and in his first scene he promises to "pluck bright honor from the palefaced moon." This correlation of nighttime and youthful dreams can even be seen to join Hal and his father in Welles. In his soliloquy on sleep Bolingbroke speaks longingly of a "wet sea-son in an hour so rude" whose eyes are "sealed up" in sleep despite the "rude imperious surge"—while he himself, even "in the calmest and most stillest night," is denied repose. And in the rejection scene Hal describes his life with Falstaff as a "dream" which, "being awaked," he does now "despise." In every case, however, there is little sense that the dreams or vigor or even the illusion of youth can be maintained in the face of time and history—so that the "chimes at midnight" eventually take on a funereal tone. Indeed, the final shot before the end credits is an explicitly Wellesian crane shot (recalling the opening sequence of *Touch of Evil*) in which Falstaff's massive coffin is rolled slowly out of the Inn, away from the camera, while the voice-over narrator ironically extols "The new King" who was "so humane withal that he left no offense unpunished, nor friendship unrewarded."

* * * * *

I take it as axiomatic that one's "reading" of Prince Hal, both in Shakespeare and Welles, depends largely upon one's reading of the context wherein he functions. I have already suggested that the thematic background in Welles varies significantly from that in Shakespeare. Another relationship important to our understanding of Prince Hal involves his "place" in the film's visual matrix.

Though *Chimes at Midnight* is visually a more restrained film than either of Welles' other two Shakespearean adaptations (*Macbeth* and *Othello*), its mise-en-scène is in fact highly patterned and richly evocative. In thematic terms we can describe *Chimes at Midnight* as an elegy for Falstaff and for his mighty though doomed effort to link the extremes of youth (Hal) and age (himself) in a timeless synthesis of wit and good fellowship. In visual terms Welles employs a mise-en-scène which also involves extremes, of height and depth, of background and foreground—with the general movement of the film being both backward, in the direction of the throne, which is repeatedly presented as occupying the background in deep focus long shots, and downward, toward death, as we see in the battle sequence which resolves itself into close-ups of bodies writhing in the mud of Shrewsbury field. The theme/space relationship is especially clear in the rejection scene where Hal ascends the throne by walking *away* from Falstaff, who kneels at Hal's feet during Hal's set speech, and who subsequently walks away in long shot into the nighttime shadows of the castle, never to be seen alive again. One scene in particular is especially important to the present discussion—both for the degree to which it determines our sense of Hal's motives and also for the way it helps to define Hal's "place" in the visual world of the film. I speak, of course, of Hal's crucial soliloquy in *1 Henry IV*, I.ii.

Central to a reading of Shakespeare's Hal as a "modern" or "Machiavellian" prince is the degree to which Hal's conception of political power is based on expediency, and also the degree to which expediency seems self-evidently its own justification. Ultimately what is most distressing about Shakespeare's Hal is not so much his tactics—casting and directing a political morality play with himself in the role of the prodigal son—but the degree to which in doing so he largely shuts himself off from any larger ethical conception of the world. Both Hal's basic tactic and his sense of self-containment are powerfully evidenced in the soliloquy which ends *1 Henry IV*, I.ii. I see no reason to doubt Hal's earnestness in vowing to "imitate the sun," nor his perceptiveness in knowing that by "falsify[ing] men's hopes" he "Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes" (185, 199, 202). But the language of the soliloquy in Shakespeare reads almost like a parody of the cosmological metaphors as they are used in *Richard II*, as if Hal were self-consciously rejecting the value of the "other Eden" world view. And that political self-consciousness is reinforced by the fact that Hal speaks *in soliloquy*, and, according to the generally accepted stage directions, in his own London apartment. In Welles, by contrast, Hal is *not* alone in his own space, does *not* draw his language and imagery from the font of his own premeditation, is *not* passing a calculated judgment on his fellows, and is *not* offering justification in advance for a path privately chosen if publicly pursued. Rather, Welles places Hal in a specific visual and dramatic context to which Hal's soliloquy (now speech) may be understood as essentially an intuitive and immediate *response*.

Hal's "responsiveness" is repeatedly evidenced in Welles' version of the soliloquy scene. To begin with, the issue of Hal's eventual succession to the throne—to which Hal's lines clearly point both in Shakespeare and Welles—is *not* in *Chimes at Midnight* a matter which is overtly or constantly on Hal's mind. Rather it is Welles-as-Falstaff who raises the issue. "When thou art king," he asks of Hal, "let not us who are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty" (again the correlation of nighttime with youthful license). And it is in direct reply to Sir John's questions that Hal speaks those lines of the speech which Welles retains. The issue is also raised for Hal in the mise-en-scène. His exchange with Falstaff takes place at the door of the Inn and is photographed in shot/reverse shot—Falstaff framed against the tavern doorway (the dirt tavern yard, where we will eventually see his coffin, occasionally visible behind him), while Hal is framed alternately by Falstaff and, when Hal turns to face Sir John, by the castle wall which looms high in the deep background of the frame. Hal has little choice in such a context, physically and metaphorically "caught between the tavern and the castle," but to contemplate the contrast between his "pot of ale" present and his dynastic future—and his statement that he will "imitate the sun" seems far less a promise than a prediction of the inevitable, which Hal only now seems to be acknowledging.[6] Indeed, Welles' Hal makes no vow to "falsify men's hopes" (the line is cut), and even the kingly figure of speech (the "sun" metaphor) seems to be drawn directly from Hal's immediate context. Most of the scene is shot with Hal in the foreground and Falstaff in the background so that Hal is either looking away at the castle (which is off frame), down at the bare branches of a tree (these recall the bare trees of the film's prologue sequence), or, most crucially, *up* at the sun—the latter glance occurring just prior to Hal's speaking of the line.

The contrast of the two Hals could not, I submit, be clearer—despite the fact that both characters eventually succeed to the crown. Shakespeare's Hal is a prince who only pretends to be a madcap, always maintaining a crucial distance between his private if political purposes and his role as madcap prodigal. Indeed, his soliloquy in Shakespeare serves more than anything else to assert that distinction—to make it a central fact in any possible interpretation of Hal's character. In Welles, on the other hand, the distance in question is less dramatic than temporal, a matter of the gap between Hal's intuitive responsiveness to the present and his awareness that time will eventually crown him king. Even when Hal's enthusiastic responsiveness is most clearly at play—in the Gadshill sequence, for example—Welles' mise-en-scène calls to mind the future which Hal faces: the straight saplings, through which Hal and Poins (and Welles' camera) race so energetically, ironically anticipate the forest of pikes which line the route to Hal's coronation. And ultimately it is Hal's personal responsiveness which reconciles him with his father and ironically but effectively condemns him to rule. He is genuinely moved by his father's disapproval, for instance, and his promise to make Percy "exchange/ His glorious deeds for my indignities" seems far less calculated and far more genuinely impassioned in Welles than in Shakespeare. A similar sincerity, indeed, is evidenced in the pain Hal feels at his father's illness ("Doth it not show vilely in me to desire small beer") and in Hal's response to the prospect of his father's death ("Thy due from me/ Is tears and heavy sorrows of the blood"). Even Hal's apparent decision to invade France can be understood less as cold-calculation than as a response to the political demands of the moment, as the dying Bolingbroke makes them known to Hal.

All of which makes it doubly ironic that many Welles critics continue to read Welles' Hal as if he were motivated by a "shrewd, if callous political opportunism."[7] Such a description accords far better with Shakespeare's Hal. Indeed, if we were to characterize the Wellesian hero in general (I think, for example, of Charles Foster Kane in *Citizen Kane*, Eugene Morgan in *The Magnificent Ambersons*, or Hank Quinlan in *Touch of Evil*), he would be characterized far less by shrewdness than by exactly that combination of idealism and sadness which is so clearly evidenced in *Chimes at Midnight* by the character of Hal. The world of Orson Welles, by and large, is a world wherein love is repeatedly betrayed by time and class. The chimes which ring at midnight, in Welles' version of Shakespeare's Lancaster plays, echo through a similarly funereal universe. It is Hal's tragedy that he too hears the bells—and *responds.*

NOTES

[1] The primary sources for *Chimes at Midnight* are the two parts of *Henry IV*, though Welles also drew upon *Richard II, Henry V*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor.*

[2] For a summary of this argument see Alvin B. Kernan's influential article "The Henriad: Shakespeare's Major History Plays," in Alvin B. Kernan, ed., *Modern Shakesperean Criticism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970), pp. 245-75.

[3] For an extended discussion of the dynastic theme see John Wilders, *The Lost Garden* (Totowa, N. J.: Rowan and Littlefield, 1978).

[4] All citations to Shakespeare are to Alfred Harbage, ed., *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969), here lines 34-35. Citations to *Chimes at Midnight* refer directly to the film soundtrack.

[5] *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1979), p. 23.

[6] Samuel Crowl, "The Long Goodbye: Welles and Falstaff," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 31 (1980), 375. Other interesting discussions of mise-en-scène in *Chimes at Midnight* include those by Brian Henderson, "The Long Take," *Film Comment*, 7 (1971), 6-11; and Stanley S. Rubin, "Welles/Falstaff/Shakespeare/Welles: The Narrative Structure of 'Chimes at Midnight'," *Film Criticism*, 2 (1978), 66-71.

[7] Joseph McBride, "Chimes at Midnight" in Ronald Gottesman, ed., *Focus on Orson Welles* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 182. Other largely negative readings of Hal are found, for example, in Peter Cowie, *A Ribbon of Dreams* (South Brunswick, N. J.: A. S. Barnes, 1973) and James Naremore, *The Magic World of Orson Welles* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978).

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 67-77
Vol. 56, No. 1

EQUITY IN SHAKESPEARE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

W. Nicholas Knight*

David Bevington has taught us how to look for politics in Tudor drama and I would like to attempt to apply his exemplary methodology and findings to the concept of absolute justice or equity in Shakespeare and Spenser in something of a contrast to Jonson and Middleton. Before Queen Elizabeth in *Comedy of Errors* and *Merchant of Venice,* and later before King James I in the subsequent two performances of the *Merchant* and, the then new, *Measure for Measure*, Shakespeare argued for the particular "fount of mercy," a phrase William Lambarde used to refer to the courts of equity when he was a Master of Chancery. Jonson and Middleton, on the other hand, criticized and made fun of equity and Chancery preferring common law, predictable, and non-interpretive practices.

England had evolved within its judicial institutions a bifurcated system of law, not unlike the American system wherein the appellate courts compliment but can also override lower court decisions. Chancery had this function alongside and occasionally over Queen's Bench in Elizabethan times. Hence Chancery's Lord Chancellor with a tradition from the ecclesiastical Courts could interpret law upheld by the chief Justice of the lower common law courts as do Portia in *Merchant of Venice* and Mercilla, Britomart, and Astrea in Book V of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and as had Mercy in *Mankind.*

> Let Mercy excede Justice, dere Mother,
> amytt his supplycacyon,
> Equyte to be leyde over party, and
> mercy to prevayll. (ll.758-59)[1]

The mock court in *Mankind* parodies not only the manor-court but certain elements of the divine court in *The Castle of Perseverance*. The subsequent portion of *Mankind* reclaims the proper order by inverting what went on in the mock court. Finally the divine court is restored by Mercy's actions and his allusions to Justice, Equity, Truth and Mercy.

So in the very emergence of early English Drama during the fifteenth century the deployment of a judicial framework is evident. Just as in Greek Drama (Athena in the *Oresteia*), we see equity being employed on the divine level and then used to infuse the operations of human courts. Obviously, equity has a very superior source but it is a concept whose operation can be administered at the human level and has the potentiality of being institutionalized and revered in the judicial system.

During the late Renaissance in England there were, quite naturally, writers cynical about, and those who supported, the system. Both factions probed and anatomized, defended and justified the basic assumptions concerning absolute justice and natural law in their society. The nature of these activities indicates that for many it was no longer possible to take the basic

*Department of Humanities, University of Missouri, Rolla, Missouri 65401

assumptions for granted. If we look carefully at Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and *A View of Ireland*, Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure, King Lear,* and *Troilus and Cressida*, Jonson's plays Donne's *Anniversaries*, Jacobean drama (particularly that of Marston, Webster, Middleton, Beaumont and Ford), the Puritan divines (for example, William Perkins), and especially the treatises from the Inns of Court on Equity (*επιείκεια*) and Chancery (by, for example, Christopher St. Germain, William West, Thomas Ashe, Edward Hake, and William Lambarde) which influenced some of the better known authors, we are able to make out the undeniable signs of a cultural crisis over the definitions of, authority for, and proper means of invoking, divine and natural law. Apparently in this controversy sides were drawn between Chancery and Queen's or King's Bench.

Ben Jonson employed in his plots and particularly in his final acts the legal concepts we have been discussing. Furthermore, Jonson dedicated plays to and, along with Shakespeare, had plays performed at, the Inns of Court where many chancellors and judges were trained.

Ben Jonson uses a Justice of the Peace in his first major play, *Every Man in His Humour* (1598). The character is Justice Clement, who after appearing only briefly in an impromptu inquest in Act III, enters the last act and concludes the comedy with the following verdict:

> . . . while we are at supper, you two shall penitently fast it out in my court, without; and if you will, you may pray there that we may be so merry within as to forgive, or forget you, when we come out.
> Good complement! . . . Come, I conjure the rest to put off all discontent.
> 'Tis well, 'tis well! This night we'll dedicate to friendship, love and laughter.[2]

Justice Clement dispenses equity through comic, restorative justice, making the punishments fit the crimes. A hack poet has to wear sackcloth and sit in the ashes of his own papers. Jonson had equally morally powerful figures at the end of his plays dispensing equity during Elizabeth's reign in *Everyman Out, Cynthia's Revels* and the *Poetaster.* What happens to the Justice-figure in Jonson's later work is significant and proclaims the decadence of the judicial concepts under discussion in Renaissance comic drama.

1594 marked a year in which several of Shakespeare's plays work with the concept of equity paralleling the similar explosion of the subject matter into a number of treatises, in print, being revised, in manuscript and in preparation. One of these in new printing was the highly influential William West's *Symboleography*, a word for the legal documents of instruments representing conveyance, deeds, indentures, etc., done at Middle Temple Gate and had added to it in this year of 1594, before *Comedy of Errors* was performed, "another Treatise of Equities, [on] the jurisdiction and proceedings of the high Court of Chauncerie." From time to time, West cites passages from Christopher St. Germain's *Doctor and Student*, a debate between a Doctor of Divinity and a Student of Laws so popular that an edition had come out every few years since 1528. Furthermore, some of these editions had been

printed at Middle Temple. Shakespeare's fellow dramatists, Ben Jonson and John Marston, read *Doctor and Student* as they take a word from the treatise and use it respectively in *Every Man Out of His Humour* (III.iv)., dedicated to the Inns of Court, and Marston's *Satires* (III.viii), written in his rooms at Middle Temple. The word picked up, misspelling and all, is "synderesis." Marston writes "returne sacred Synderesis,/ Inspire our trunckes," and Jonson mocks it in a list of inkhorn terms as "the soules of Synderisis." *Synteresis* (συντηρησις) is Greek for the mystical bond between the body and the soul, the flesh and the spirit; and in *Doctor and Student* it signifies the spark of life that *Equitie* (the bond) gives to the *Law* (the flesh) and *Justice* (the spirit of the law), thus making a living legal system out of the bare bones of the letter of the law.

William West, quoting Christopher St. Germain's *Doctor and Student*, says in his 1594 edition:

> . . . equitie may mitigate Rigorem iuris [rigorous justice], which equitie is no other thing, than an exception of the law of God, or the law of reason, from the general principles of man's positive law, not agreeing with them in some particularity, which exception is inwardly employed in every general ground or maxim of the Law. (Section 29c)

The concept of mercy accommodating man's written laws to human necessity is precisely the subject of the first scene in *The Comedy of Errors*. The Duke of Ephesus, Solinus, explicates the legal situation Aegeon, a merchant from Syracuse, has created by his entering Ephesus: "I am not partial to infringe our laws, [your Duke having] seal'd his rigorous statutes with their [i.e., Ephesian's] bloods,/ Excludes all pity from our threatening looks./ Therefore by law thou art condemn'd to die." Aegeon pleads for equity from natural law arguments and says, ". . . the world may witness that my end/ Was wrought by nature, not by vile offence, . . ." and feels his search for his family has led him into a "merciless" predicament. The Duke speaks of the conflict between his personal empathy and his official duty: ". . . we may pity, though not pardon thee."

> were it not against our laws,
> Against my crown, my oath, my dignity,
> Which princes, would they, may not disannul,
> My soul should sue as advocate for thee.
> But, though thou art adjudged to the death
> And passed sentence may not be recall'd
> But to our honour's great disparagement,
> Yet, I will favour thee in what I can. (cf. ll.4-150)[3]

West goes on from the earlier passage to indicate that clemency is only proper to a Prince, one who legislates as well as judges.

The Duke grants Aegeon one day in which to obtain the 1,000 mark ransom. Finally in the last scene, Solinus is so moved by the circumstances

that have united Aegeon's family against all odds that he refuses to accept the offer of even a few ducats.

> *Antipholus of Ephesus.* These ducats pawn I for my father here.
>
> *Duke.* It shall not need; thy father hath his life. (V.i.389-90)

The Duke is following West's observation:

> Wherefore in some cases it is necessary to leave the Words of the Law, and to follow that reason and Justice requireth and to that Intent Equity is ordained; that is to say, to temper and mitigate the rigor of the Law. (p.53)

The Comedy of Errors dramatizes a court of equity where the ruler suspends the law, taking the nature of the circumstances into consideration. The play is also similar to *Doctor of Divinity and Student of Laws* insofar as the Roman law (*lex scripta*) is mitigated by Christian theology appropriate to Solinus (Solin, representing the law-giver) ruling mercifully over the Ephesians (subject of St. Paul's Epistle).

Shakespeare's use of justice and equity goes back to the Moralities where equity resides in a female character working with the judicial figure. The return of an authority figure dispensing justice from a throne with the advice of a female character, as in *The Castle of Perseverance*, appears at the end of *All's Well That Ends Well* (1602-03) with Helena directing the King of France's prerogative. This is fully developed in the equity function of Portia in *The Merchant of Venice* (1596) over the pound of flesh demanded by Shylock. Noteworthy is the divine authority for judicial equity as she argues before the judge: "from heaven," "an attribute to God himself." Portia dramatizes the popular conjunction of Divine mercy and judicial equity by insisting upon an extremely rigorous reading of the letter of the law in order to achieve her humane purpose.

In *The Merchant of Venice*, William Shakespeare is not just dramatizing a generalized court scene and sentimentalizing about mercy; rather, he is presenting Chancery procedure and advocating that it be used precisely along its theoretical lines, so as not to abrogate the common law of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, and thus becoming merely a rival court. William Lambarde was referring to Chancery in his manuscript of *Archeion* as the "Gate of Mercie" and he championed reform from within in order to preserve its unique jurisdiction. In *Merchant*, Shakespeare puts to obvious use readings that could be found in William West's *Symboleography* and Christopher St. Germain's *Doctor and Student*. The "mercy" of the high Court of Chancery's equitable decisions by the Lord Chancellor is not to be confused with the simple clemency or empathetic pity of Solinus in *The Comedy of Errors* and Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, nor the somewhat easy piety of Germain's *Doctor and Student*, for William West says:

> There is a difference between Equitie and Clemencie: for Equitie is alwaies most firmly knit to the evil of the law which way so ever it bends, whether to clemency, or to severity.[4]

Seemingly extraneous, Biblical directives are most apparent in the Duke of Venice's "How shalt thou hope for mercy, rendering none?" (IV.i.88). These, however, are also present, in, and involved by, Germain:

> . . . thou do to another as thou wouldst should be done to thee . . . that in every general Rule of the Law thou do observe and keep Equity.[5]

This, in turn, serves an institutionalized, judicial function in the procedure of Chancery, which as a Court of Conscience operates *in personam*, upon oath to insure that the plaintiff has come before the Bench "with clean hands." Observe in the familiar passage, operating at the same time, Portia's, and of course Shakespeare's, precise sense of how equity accomplishes justice, how Chancery has a remedial function over the strictures of the common law, how a person within an institution can reflect the hope that the application of its system can transcend the system's own limitations to achieve the idealized purpose for which the institution was constructed:

> *Portia.* The quality of mercy is not strain'd
> It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
> Upon the place beneath: it is twice blest;
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes:
> 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes
> The throned monarch better than his crown;
> His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;
> But mercy is above this sceptred sway;
> It is entrhoned in the hearts of kings,
> It is an attribute to God himself;
> And earthly power doth then show likest God's
> When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
> Though justice by thy plea, consider this,
> Than, in the course of justice, none of us
> Should see salvation: we do pray for mercy;
> And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
> The deeds of mercy. I have spoke thus much
> To mitigate the justice of thy plea;
> Which if thou follow, this strict court of Venice
> Must needs give sentence 'gainst the merchant there.
>
> *Shylock.* My deeds upon my head! I crave the law,
> The penalty and forfeit of my bond. (IV.i.195-206)

Portia speaks of the residual power residing in Chancery. The Lord Chancellor was regarded as the Keeper of the King's Conscience, regulating the monarch's justice with his mercy exercised as equity in Chancery. The Chancellors used to hold high ecclesiastical office, as did Thomas-a-Beckett who was also Archbishop of Canterbury in the time of Henry II; or they had a very independent religious consciousness, as did Sir Thomas More under Henry VIII. In

Elizabeth's reign, they were secular jurists but had to uphold their moral obligations; under King James, Sir Francis Bacon was impeached by Parliament upon the charge of accepting bribes.

Portia's speech is mirrored by a clerk of Chancery in his own famous work. Edmund Spenser was granted by Queen Elizabeth the office of clerk in Chancery and he published in the year of *The Merchant of Venice* (1596):

> Most sacred virtue she [Justice] of all the rest,
> Resembling God in his imperiall might;
> Whose soveraine powre is herein most exprest,
> That both to good and bad he dealeth right,
> And all his workes with Justice hath bedight,
> That powre he also doth to Princes lend,
> And makes them like himselfe in glorious sight,
> To sit in his owne seate, his cause to end,
> And rule his people right, as he doth recommend.[6]
>
> Some Clarkes doe doubt in their devicefull art,
> Whether his heavenly thing, whereof I treat,
> To weeten *Mercie*, be of Justice part,
> Or dawne forth from her divine extreate
> This well I wote, that sure she is as great,
> And meriteth to have as high a place,
> Sith in the' Almighties everlasting seat
> She first was bred, and borne of heavenly race;
> From thence pour'd down on men, by influence of grace.[7]
>
> Who will not mercie unto others shew,
> How can he mercy ever hope to have?
> To pay each with his owne is right and dew.
> Yet since ye mercie now doe need to crave,
> I will it graunt. . . .[8]

Equity and mercy as attributes of Chancery are very much in the legal wind of London in 1596 with Germain's *Doctor and Student*, West's *Symboleography*, Lambarde's *Archeion*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*.

Portia's famous "Quality of mercy" speech is not just an idealistic invocation but a reminder that it is a Court of Equity that has been convened where, as she says, "mercy seasons justice" and one can come "to mitigate the justice of [the] plea." As St. Germain recognizes, "Equity is a right Wiseness that considereth all the particular circumstances of the Deed the which also is tempered with the Sweetness of Mercy." He continues,

> If thou take all that the words of the Law giveth thee [which is the 'rigorous course' (IV.i.8) of Shylock's action upon the due and forfeit of his bond (IV.i.35)], thou shalt sometime do against the law. (p. 52)

Portia's ruling of a pound of flesh only, and no blood as the award to be taken from Antonio by Shylock is a severely precise reading of the letter of the

law—the reverse of what is expected when one seeks leniency, a loose interpretation, or a moderated sentence. This is a dramatic and legalistic triumph of Shakespeare's design to illustrate how Chancery should fulfill the instruction that "Equity followeth the Law in all particular cases where Right and Justice requireth, notwithstanding the general Rule of the Law be to the contrary." The very terms of the bond were instructive in the debate between law and justice as Shakespeare would have read in West and was picked up by later writers on Equity from Gray's Inn, such as Thomas Ashe:

> For it is bee understood that the law hath two parts, *Carnem & Animam*: the letter resembleth the flesh [and that was Shylock's due], and the intent and reason the soule [Equity is the spirit of the law].[9]

After 1603 and the death of Queen Elizabeth, the new English King James came from Scotland with his principles of Divine Right to become the throned Monarch. Insofar as Scotland had no separate jurisdiction for equity in the manner that England did, Chancery was threatened from a new direction by the King's desire to assert his prerogative. Particularly ominous was his ordering a pickpocket hanged without trial during his Progress from Scotland to London. Because of plague, this Progress ended with the King residing at Hampton Court outside London, where Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (1604) was designed for his entertainment. The play served as a complicated mirror for His Majesty. It warned against using the law to interfere arbitrarily with the fabric of society by either strict or loose following of the law and its letter. Angelo, the Duke of Vienna's deputy, in attempting a moral reformation of Viennese society by rigorous interpretation of statutes exposes a flaw. It can be quite impractical to alter custom by a rigid application of the law. The returning Duke, on the other hand, engaging in rectifying Angelo's administrative difficulties, exposes the disruption caused by personal and arbitrary manipulation of the judicial system, even if it is for the purpose of offering remedy for injustices. The intervention of prerogative action despite commendable motive, just as a strict application might be for a high moral purpose, nevertheless does violence to precedent, form, due process, and procedure designed to protect the law and preserve individual rights. King James was being told to be humane, and just, and to follow English precedent, interpretation and equity in his judicial capacity. The audacity of this program is tempered by the convention of art of instructing a ruler and by being in the tradition of an Inns of Court entertainment, such as *Gorboduc* before the Queen, or *Mirror for Magistrates*.

Middleton's *Michaelmas Term* can be studied to find that it contains only one legal word that Shakespeare does not use in his plays and is a text that makes lawyers out to be not only villains but ones who use leniency and legal protection of equity to their advantage.

As in Shakespeare, who has Silence mention that his son to his cost is to go to the Inns of Court (*2 Henry IV*, III.ii.13), so also Quomodo, continuing Middleton's own theme of inheritance, has a son at the Inns; but one who will receive and carry on Quomodo's gulling: "Thus we that seldom get lands honestly must leave our heirs to inherit our knavery" (II.iii.85-89).[10] The scene over loans develops into one reminiscent of Shakespeare's *Merchant*

of Venice, and Middleton moves from conversational phrases into deeper transactions within themes appropriate to the jurisdiction of equity, courts of conscience, Chancery, and financial redemption. Quomodo apologizes upon being introduced to Easy with: "Then I cry you mercy, sir, . . ." (l.103). This is not suggestive merely of being in the mercy of the court but his hope for leniency in negotiating a loan. Again he parodies the theological tradition of the jurisdiction when he indicates his money is tied up:

> Upon my religion, Master Blastfield, bonds He forfeit in my hands; I expect the receipt of a thousand every hour, and cannot yet set eye of a penny.
> . . .Tis mine own pity that plots against me, Master Blastfield; they know I have no conscience to take the forfeiture, and that makes 'em bold with my mercy. (ll.111-13, 115-17)

By comparing, in passing, Middleton's law language in this play to that of Shakespeare's works, we find that, except for only one word ("recullance" III.iv.229), Shakespeare had used all the legalisms in his plays also. The twofold import of that is: (1) that Shakespeare knew law sufficiently to do as much with it if not more (and did more on abstract levels of equity and issues in law—*Measure for Measure*) than other dramatists known to be closer to the Inns of Court, and (2) that now Middleton's law language can be viewed as even more sophisticated and integrated with his other themes forming an overall linguistic unity to a depth not previously noted.

Like Middleton's ridicule of the corruption lawyers bring to the law, so Jonson's 1612 emendations at the same time as they indicate a greater awareness of the corrupt society acknowledge the falling off of the moral voice. Concomitantly an increased comic sense emphasizes mirth as the solution to the situation. As is indicated by the later evolution of the representative of justice, specifically in *The Alchemist*, Jonson's comic sense subordinates final moral considerations to its mirth and the changing of Lorenzo senior from a moral voice into a more willing recipient of Clement's mirth is symptomatic of this.

Bartholomew Fair (1614) exemplifies how the evolution of the relationship between Jonson's comic sense and moral interest can result in the complete inversion of the role of the Justice. The *avocatori* in *Volpone* (1606) is corrupt. The judicial representative, or figure functioning in a similar capacity, is faked in *Epicoene* (1609), bribed in the *Alchemist* (1610), and foiled in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614).

Justice Adam Overdo is the main character of *Bartholomew Fair*. The play is often interrupted by a madman named Troubleall who keeps crossing the stage asking everyone, "Sir, show me your warrant, I know nothing without a warrant . . ." (p. 525).[11]

> *Troubleall*: Have you any warrant for this, gentlemen?
> *Quarlous & Winwife*: Ha!
> *Troubleall*: There must be a warrant had, believe it.

> *Winwife*: For what?
> *Troubleall*: For whatsoever it is, anything indeed, no matter what. (p. 527)

Questioning authorization undermines the prerogative powers upon which equity depends for its effectual jurisdiction. Only a remnant of the Mercy-figure is still apparent in Justice Overdo.

> I will be more tender hereafter, I see compassion may become a Justice, though it be a weakness, I confess; and nearer a vice, than a virtue. (p. 521)

The inability of Justice Overdo to accept mercy as a virtue destroys the viability of his justice, but, on the other hand, if he exercises compassion, circumstances force him to relinquish his prerogative position. The crooks tell the Justice:

> . . . remember you are but Adam, flesh and blood! You have your frailty, forget your other name of Overdo . . . (p. 568)

Justice is kin to the follies of mankind instead of, as it was in *The Castle of Perseverance*, Mankind being kin to the Daughters of God. Justice Overdo does not preside over comedy, he becomes its butt; he does not stand aloof from the action but enters into it; he does not manipulate but is manipulated; he cannot judge and he is judged.

With the moral voice undermined, *Bartholomew Fair* was the last great comedy of Jonson's and bespoke the end of moral comedy until after the Restoration. Jonson died in 1637, three years before the closing of the theaters by Parliament in 1641 when

> . . . the Puritans won their sixty years' war with the dramatists, and closed the theatres. In honesty, it must be confessed that they silenced no voice of great importance.[12]

Within the year the long Parliament dissolved the prerogative courts and the Court of Star Chamber because of its vindictive punishments and associations with despotic rule under the Stuarts. Chancery received the power of equity where it finally hardened into the common law procedures of modern England after reforms in Victorian England (e.g., Dicken's *Bleak House* was a popularization of its problems as the Court was being assimilated into the single Crown court system).

The institutions of drama and prerogative law had become corrupt by the beginning of the reign of Charles I. By acts of Parliament, the Puritans, with the support of serious critics of the drama and the jurists of the period, abolished the theatres and Star Chamber. By doing so they closed the two secular avenues that had explicitly expressed the concept of Divine Mercy through the principle of equity, even after the Reformation. Before their end, each institution had given a voice to their mutual predicament from one of their number. In the drama Justice Overdo is criticized for his frailty and lack of authority and utters:

> They may have seen many a fool in the habit of Justice; but never till now, a Justice in the habit of a fool. (p. 477)

The jurist John Selden (1584-1654) voices his criticism of the jurisprudence of the period:

> Equity is a roguish thing. For law we have a measure, know what to trust to; Equity is according to the conscience of him that is Chancellor, and as that is larger or narrower, so is Equity. 'Tis all one as if they should make the standard for the measure we call a 'foot' a Chancellor's foot; what an uncertain measure would this be! One Chancellor has a long foot, another a short foot, a third an indifferent foot. 'Tis the same thing in the Chancellor's conscience.[13]

The Puritan's demand for absolute rational and moral authority in the human realm pointed up the lack of it in society; they closed the theaters, abolished the Star Chamber, and killed the King.

In *Bartholomew Fair* and the words of John Selden, we hear one result of the Reformation ("What is your warrant")—the basic assumption of the relativistic nature of human authority. When in the drama, the Mercy-figure, and, in jurisprudence, the Chancellor (whose authority was undisputed in the fifteenth centry), are, after the Reformation, seen as subject to frailty, arbitrariness and uncertainty, then the principles of equity cease to be related to Divine mercy and grace. When at the time William Perkins, a Puritan theologian

> . . . and the other divines were faced with clear violations, in the common law, of God's Scriptural law or of Christian equity as they understood it, they invariably engaged in rather shocking casuistry to defend the common law.

It was Perkins who had said there was "good reason then that lawyers take the Divines' advice, touching Equitie, which is the intent of the law," but he had found one kind of man reprehensible:

> . . . such . . . (as by a certain foolish kinde of pitty, are so carried away), that would have nothing but mercie, mercie. . . ."[14]

In the face of rigorous and harsh justice, we have seen how the drama from 1405-1641 presented alternative mercy in theology and equity in the law; and, in turn, observed that the theatre borrowed the legal concept of equity to structurally resolve plot situations by introducing a higher, but more arbitrary, system of law. In turn this highly just but arbitrary concept of equity was defended by Shakespeare, Bacon, Ellesmere, Lambarde, Hooker and other natural law and Chancery apologists of having to appeal to abstractions and ultimate mysteries of divine grace, as had the Greeks. Ben Jonson, Coke, Perkins, Selden and other Puritanical divines and jurists complained about the aristocratic tyranny, associated with equity's privileged administration proclaiming the necessity of predictable, unvarying human written law as sufficient to meet the totality of human failings. To accomplish seeming

equality, rather than equity before the law, and to ignore exceptions, rather than have law achieve exceptional remedies became the aim of justice. Shakespeare, along with Spenser, commended the concept of equity while some of their other contemporaries, notably Jonson and Middleton, did not.

NOTES

[1] "The Castle of Perseverance," in *The Macro Plays*, ed. Mark Eccles (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969).

[2] V.iv.68-72, 93-94, and 109-10, in *English Drama 1580-1642*, eds. D. F. Tucker Brooke and Nathaniel Burton Paradise (Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1933).

[3] Shakespeare text is *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961).

[4] William West, *Symboleography* (London: Imprinted by C. Yetsweirt, Esq., 1594), Section 28.

[5] Christopher St. Germain, *Doctor and Student* (London, 1715), p. 57.

[6] Edmund Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, ed. J. C. Smith and E. DeSelincourt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), II, V.i.10.

[7] Ibid., V.x.i.

[8] Ibid., VI.i.43.

[9] Thomas Ashe, Επιείκεια (London: For the Society of the Stationers, 1609), quoting William West's *Symboleography*.

[10] Thomas Middleton, *Michaelmas Term*, ed. Richard Levin (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1966).

[11] Text: *Five Plays by Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).

[12] Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961), pp. 96-111.

[13] "Equity" in *Table Talk*, (London, 1889).

[14] Charles H. and Katherine George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation 1570-1640* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961), p. 229.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 79-89
Vol. 56, No. 1

FEMALE TRANSVESTISM IN RENAISSANCE COMEDY "A NATURAL PERSPECTIVE, THAT IS AND IS NOT"

Shirley F. Staton*

Female transvestism, or disguise in male clothing, occurs often enough in Renaissance literature to invite our close scrutiny. Disguise in general stands as a central Renaissance trope—perhaps the central one of the entire period. More specifically, female cross-dressing appears in translations of classical drama, of Greek romances, and of medieval legends. It also enters into such popular works as the *Metamorphoses, Decameron, Orlando Furioso, Arcadia, Faerie Queene,* and most notably into Renaissance stage comedy. Beaumont and Fletcher, Lyly, Greene, Jonson, and Shakespeare use the transvestite convention.[1] "What an odd double confusion it must have made," Charles Lamb mused, "to see a boy play a woman playing a man: one cannot disentangle the perplexity without some violence to the imagination."[2] Six out of seven Shakespearean comedies employ this complicated double transvestism. More importantly, these female characters remain masked throughout a substantial and even crucial part of these plays. This prominent use of female disguise reveals the interdependency of dramatic structure and Renaissance gender assumptions. Moreover, study of this interdependency suggests that each play tends to lean in one of two directions according to how the cross-dressing convention is used. On one hand, plays like Lyly's *Gallathea* (c. 1584-88), Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* (c. 1596-97), *As You Like It* (c. 1599), and *Twelfth Night* (c. 1601-02) use gender disguise functionally to free the heroine from conventional limitations by fusing together "feminine" and "masculine" traits. On the other hand, plays like Greene's *James IV* (c. 1591), Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* (c. 1608-10), Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (c. 1593-94), and *Cymbeline* (c. 1609-10) employ gender disguise emblematically to reinforce a patriarchal paradigm concerning woman's identity: an idealized female exemplifying chastity, patient endurance, "obedience, fear and niceness."[3]

Understanding the relationship of gender assumptions and dramatic structure is best accomplished by examining how female disguises actually work within specific comedies. In actuality these plays share a common linear pattern. Often responding to a father figure's initial action, the young woman disguises herself as a man and flees to another locale—usually a magic forest where laws of time and causality seem almost suspended. Within this special space, she undergoes adventures and sometimes trials, both physical and psychological. Finally, her unmasking triggers the dénouement and leads to the "happy" ending of marriage and patriarchal family reconciliation.

Of course, my account of this pattern sounds very much like Northrop Frye's description of the mythos of Romance, whose essential element lies in the adventurous quest.[4] However, it is in the romantic comedies, by and large, that a group of plays uses transvestism to free the heroine. What the disguised female "gives[s] and hazard[s] all"[5] to gain is not the discovery and

*Department of English and Philosophy, Purdue University—Calumet, Hammond, IN 46323

slaying of the dragon but the discovery of her identity—the uncovering of who she can be. As Frye suggests elsewhere, comedy's "loss of identity is most frequently a loss of sexual identity."[6] Thus, in these plays, the heroine's quest becomes possible only through a temporary divesting of feminine apparel and a subsequent donning of male garb. The resultant questioning of gender provides the dynamic for the heroine's quest.

The heroines Gallathea, Rosalind as Ganymede, Viola as Cesario, and Portia as Balthazar explore their potentials as human, not just female, beings and temporarily create androgynous or hermaphroditic identities. Through the process of self-revelation, these females stand at the heart of the dramatic interactions and transformations. They do not control the comic action in the same way as do the puppeteers Thesus/Oberon, the Duke of Dark Corners, or Prospero. Rather, they help to shape events by an openness to human give-and-take. For example, in one of the earliest Renaissance comedies to exploit the female transvestite convention, Lyly's delightful *Gallathea*, instead of a single androgynous female, two disguised heroines set up a parallel structure. Dressed as boys by their fathers, both Gallathea and Phillida fall in love with one another and, after an initial discomfort with their respective masculine roles, enter more skillfully and even enthusiastically into wooing and being wooed. Their mutually puzzled attraction toward the other's sexual ambiguity is foregrounded by patterned dialogues, parallel asides, and echoic soliloquies such as the following:

> Poore *Phillida*, what shouldest thou thinke of thyselfe, that lovest one that I feare mee, is as thyselfe is; and may it not bee, that her father practized the same deceit with her, that my father hath with me, . . . if it bee so, *Phillida*, how desperate is they case? if it be not, how doubtful? . . . I will after him or her. . . .[7]

Continuing to echo one another within the play's magic forest, these mirror heroines, these ambiguous hermaphrodites, epitomize the play's theme of confused genders and identities. As one critic says, "The juxtaposed scenes create a series of internal echoes, parallels, and balanced contrasts that dance forward with expanded meaning and rhythm."[8] The expanded meaning depends on the continuing gender confusion. Ultimately, the Goddess Venus will resolve the lovers' dilemma (Renaissance literature always assumes that female homosexuality cannot be consummated physically) by changing one of the heroines into a male. But neither "shall know whose lot it shall bee till they come to the church doore" (V.3). Neither, we might add, will the audience know since the "churche doore," like the wedding bed, remains off-stage.

In *As You Like It*, some of the same fun with bi-sexual potential transfuses the multiple layering of Rosalind-as-Ganymede-playing Rosalind. The wearing of the doublet and hose (even though she protests she has not these in her disposition)[9] enables Rosalind to be masculine as well as feminine. Courage, adventuresomeness, competency, and articulateness complement modesty and tenderness. The liberating effects of male garments appear in the marked contrast between the court's gown-wearing Rosalind and the forest's doublet-wearing Ganymede. In the earlier scenes, both she and Celia respond alike to the men and problems around them; indeed, Celia seems more outspoken than

Rosalind. Later, however, Rosalind's disguise takes over, for "doublet and hose ought to show itself courageous to petticoat" (II.iv.6-7). Henceforth, Celia is protected, relegated to the domestic sphere while Rosalind-Ganymede confronts, interacts, and metamorphoses within the public domain. As Ganymede, a name evoking classical and medieval tales about bisexuality,[10] Shakespeare's androgyne supports distressed Celia, finds lodging, parries with Touchstone, critiques Petrarchan poetry, upbraids Phoebe, champions Silvius, and entangles Orlando in love's irrevocable coils. Because of her double gender, the heroine functions as the hub of the drama's actions. She reconciles what Anne Barton calls the play's thematic oppositions of "court and country, nature and fortune, youth and age, realism and romaticism. . . ."[11] As with Rosalind-Ganymede's own masculine-feminine dualism, these reconciliations preserve the individuality of each opposition.

Unlike *As You Like It*'s heroine, *Twelfth Night*'s Viola-Cesario does not overlay feminine with masculine traits but instead fuses them both into a truly androgynous whole. As Marilyn French suggests, Viola can do this because she starts out with no role, no fixed identity.[12] "Conceal me what I am," Viola instructs the sea captain in her first on-stage scene, "for such disguise as haply shall become/ The form of my intent" (I.ii.53-54). The form of her intent coincides with the drama's focal action: cross-dressing in order to cross gender-defined barriers. By so doing, she creates her identity. Viola, however, needs time to fulfill her potential being. Critics, I think, misread *Twelfth Night*'s heroine when they see her as unwilling to take responsibility for events and depending on Time to solve all. Her apostrophe, "O Time, thou must untangle this, not I,/ It is too hard a knot for me t'untie" (II.ii.40-41) besides echoing and linking with Olivia's earlier apostrophe to Fate (I.v.310-11) emphasizes Viola–Cesario's legitimate need of time–time, in fact, to become herself.

Along with time, the "good youth" Viola-Cesario also needs space in which to shape her intent, a need fulfilled by Olivia's garden. At Orsino's quarters, Viola-Cesario is modest and subordinate; at Olivia's, she is imaginative, mirthful, saucy, and, above all, verbal. Just as for *As You Like It*'s transvestite heroine, language provides Viola-Cesario with the means for self-exploration. As Rosalind-Ganymede had converted traditional misogynistic polemics into spurs for Orlando's love (III.ii), in various ways *Twelfth Night*'s heroine subverts courtly love codes in order to discover herself. As Orsino's emissary to Olivia, Viola-Cesario mocks rhetorical artifice, halting her string of hyperbolic clichés–"Most radiant, exquisite, and unmatable beauty" (I.v. 170-71)–make sure she is addressing the right woman because this tough-minded androgyne feels "loath to cast away" her "poetical" speech on the wrong recipient. She steps out of her role of courtly courtier to swap slang with Maria ("No, good swabber, I am to hull here a little longer" [I.v.203]), and to comment frankly on Olivia's revealed face (Excellently done, if God did all" [I.v.236]). Then she reverses herself yet again and caps her saucy subversion of courtly love ritual by her delicious and decorous peroration: "If I did love you in my master's flame,/ . . . [I would] Make me a willow cabin at your gate . . ." (I.v.264-69). No wonder Olivia falls for her. Who could resist such imaginative variety, such "transvestite loveliness"?[13] Viola-Cesario is so obviously enjoying herself and is so full of her newly discovered androgynous talents, that her high spirits become contagious. Indeed, Olivia herself enters into the fun of seeking and questioning identity:

Oli. Stay!
I prithee tell me what thou think'st of me.
Vio. That you do think you are not what you are.
Oli. If I think so, I think the same of you.
Vio. Then think you right: I am not what I am.
Oli. I would you were as I would have you be.
Vio. Would it be better, madam, than I am?
I wish it might for now I am your fool. (III.i.137-44)

And just as Shakespearean Wise Fools like Feste and Touchstone radicalize our insights about time and identity, so the transvestite heroines challenge our assumptions about gender. These characters make clear that "gender plays an organizing role in psychic structure similar to other modalities of cognition such as space, time, causation. . . ."[14] Viola-Cesario's androgyny stimulates us to rethink supposed sexual opposites and to redefine our human identity.

Structurally as well as thematically, Viola-Cesario's hermaphroditism puts her at the apex of the play's love triangle. As French points out, the three-sided confusion—Viola loves Orsino who loves Olivia who loves Viola-Cesario—can find resolution only by a splitting of the androgynous heroine into both male and female.[15] Viola-Cesario becomes twins—Viola and Sebastian. "One face, one voice, one habit, and two persons," Orsino exclaims wonderingly; "How have you made a division of yourself?" he asks (V.i.216; 222). Her division, of course, follows from her transvestite disguise, "A natural perspective, that is and is not!" (V.i.217).

In the foregoing plays—*Gallathea, As You Like It,* and *Twelfth Night*—the unknowingly Sapphic scenes between a "feminine" woman and one disguised as a man provide a special occasion for identity questing. This pattern holds true also for Green's historical romance, *James IV*, when disguised Queen Dorothea deflects Lady Anderson's adulterous passion, and for *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, when Julia-Sebastian, sent by her own beloved Proteus to court Sylvia, instead wins for herself Sylvia's affectionate pity.

While these Sapphic scenes test the androgyne's ingenuity, they also sound the theme of sisterhood: "A sister! You are she," says Olivia to Viola (*Twelfth Night* V.i.326); "Thou has won a friend," says Queen Dorothea to Lady Anderson (*James IV* V.v.39); "Come, live with me," says Arethusa to Bellario (*Philaster* V.v.194).[16] Yet if most of these dramas depict close female friendship, *The Merchant of Venice* presents an extraordinary conjunction of sisterhood and female cross-dressing. Indeed, without the shadowing presence during the trial scene of Nerissa disguised as Portia-Balthazar's law clerk, we might sometimes forget that this "second Daniel" is, after all, really Portia. The judicial robes wholly transform the heroine. Gone is the character whom we have earlier seen in self-indulgent melancholy (I.ii), suitor-baiting (II.vii), gossiping I.ii), and conniving (III.iv). Absent, too, are the blushes, faints, and general discomfort about immodest male dress that surface now and again in the other comparable plays. Instead, as the lawyer Balthazar, Portia becomes supra-human in her power. More potent than mere mortal doublets, judicial robes transmute the Lady from Belmont into an Olympian Athena, a *dea ex machina* of Mercy and Justice. Thus when her feminine appeals to both pity and mercy fail to move Shylock, this spokesperson for the Venetian State wields the Law with masculine skill and firmness. De-sexed and de-humanized

by her lawyer's robes, Portia-Balthazar speaks finally for what Lawrence Stone calls the "patrimonial bureaucracy,"[17] that is, for the male establishment of law and order with its hierarchy of caste and class. When she takes off her robes, her power shrinks, and she dwindles into a mere wife. On her return to Belmont in women's clothing, she utters lines that have provided a motto for twentieth-century cross-stitched samplers about home sweet home:

> That light we see is burning in my hall.
> How far that little candle throws his beams!
> So shines a good deed in a naughty world. (V.i.89-91)

That prim phrase about the "naughty world" seems a world apart from Balthazar's masterful forensics.

In short, *The Merchant of Venice, Twelfth Night, As You Like It,* and *Gallathea* employ the transvestite convention to free and empower the heroine. Her liberty results in exhilaration as she discovers herself to be not only womanly but also witty, assertive, imaginative, adventuresome and—in Portia's case—powerful. In today's jargon, dressing as a man raises the heroines's consciousness and encourages a positive self-image.

Just as the transvestite convention within these dramas liberates the disguised heroine, so gender reversal liberates the audience. Within the magic no-time and no-space of Arcadia, Arden, and Illyria, we travel beyond gender; we partake of the heroine's invigorating license. For Renaissance theater-goers, who delighted in fancy dress, female cross-dressing emphasized the fundamental sexual ambiguity of their staging, and thus added yet another hermaphroditic dimension.[18] And for us, as for them, these plays serve as a surrogate carnival, a Twelfth-Night celebration, when the world turns upside down and boys become bishops, or, in Natalie Zemon Davis' view, when women are on top.[19]

According to anthropologists, masks and all disguises, particularly gender disguises, instead of hiding personal traits permit us to transcend them. In these transvestite plays about young love, we can relive our adolescent fantasies of being both sexes in one—self-regenerative and thus immortal.[20] In Arcadia, woman, like man, can safely become "the master-mistress of . . . [our] passion" (Sonnet 20) or, indeed, *What You Will.*

In contrast to those plays with liberating transvestite conventions stand those that use gender disguises to uphold patriarchal paradigms. These plays not only dramatize an inherent and basic difference between maleness and femaleness but also split femininity into good or bad absolutes, into Virgin Marys or fallen Eves, Angels or Whores. Greene's *James IV*, Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* utilize cross-dressing not to free the heroine but to confine her more rigidly to the properly "female." In these works the feminine virtues of modesty, obedience, and steadfastness are exaggerated into sacrificial suffering, absolute constancy, and puritanical chastity. The heroine's male garments serve as an emblematic badge of her suffering; they both mark and enclose a paternalistic and idealized Virtuous Woman.

In these plays, self-sacrifice and suffering not only test the heroine's constancy but also become an end in themselves; one made possible by her

male disguise. Consider how Greene's *James IV*, an historical romance, is shaped by Queen Dorothea's dolorous self-sacrifice. On Dorothea's wedding day, her bridegroom, King James IV of Scotland, falls in love with another woman and orders Dorothea murdered. Accompanied by her trusty dwarf and disguised as a squire, Dorothea flees to the forest but is caught by a villainous Frenchman sent to murder her. Defending herself, she falls wounded and is left for dead. Recuperating at a nearby home, the still-disguised Dorothea is distressed by the amorous advances of the mistress of the house. Finally, James IV wishes Dorothea back because her father, the king of England, has invaded James' kingdom. Only then does Dorothea doff her disguise, return to her royal husband, make peace between him and her father (and between Scotland and England too), and forgive James' murderous infidelity. "Quite misled by youth," she excuses him, "Tut, but a little fault" (V.vi.140;160).

Although Dorothea's disguise does gain her some adventures outside the domestic sphere, her tribulations do not reveal her unexplored potentials but rather illustrate her endless capacity for absolute self-sacrifice. "Might I twise as many paines as these/ Vnite our hearts" she tells the formerly murderous James at the play's end, "Then should my wedded lord/ See how incessant labours I would take" (V.vi.162-64). Transvestism in *James IV*, as in other plays of this ilk, reinforces man's fantasy of the self-sacrifical wife whose all-forgiving constancy resembles a mother's love.

Similarly, the disguised page in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Julia-Sebastian, undergoes ordeals as emotionally tormenting, though less physically arduous. First, she witnesses her beloved Proteus' wooing of Sylvia. Then, she witnesses his attempt to rape Sylvia. Finally, she witnesses the amicable consigning of Sylvia to Proteus by Sylvia's fiancé. The tangle unravels only when the philanderer Proteus recognizes and appreciates Julia-Sebastian's devotion. "O heaven," he apostrophizes, "were man/ But constant, he were perfect" (V.iv.110-11).

But if heaven, or anyone, awarded a prize to the most patiently suffering heroine in male disguise, the palm would surely go to Imogen in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*. Let us count the ways of her martyrdom: imprisoned by a tyrannical father, ordered murdered by her husband, pursued by a would-be rapist, poisoned by a stepmother, wakened beside her supposed husband's headless body, and struck down by her seemingly repentant husband. Significantly, most of Imogen's calamities occur when she is disguised as Fidele—Fidele for fidelity.

For such heroines, however, fidelity and self-sacrifice comprise only two of the three magical virtues. The third, and the greatest of these, is Chastity. Chastity becomes the most precious gift that the heroine can give to her beloved, the pearl in the oyster; indeed, without it, she becomes worse than nothing—not an angel, but a whore.

Numerous analogues for Renaissance drama's chaste and patient transvestites appear in both medieval and Elizabethan legends. Spenser tells us that Britomart, the Knight of Chastity who rides in and out of Books III and IV of the *Faerie Queene*, is only one of a long line of such Lady Knights.[21] Even closer, however, to these plays' suffering heroines are those transvestite female saints of medieval hagiography who "put on Christ" by donning male clothes and thus spiritualize their natures. Once in male attire, they endure trials and

afflictions. In a brilliant article on female tranvestite saints, John Anson describes how this "putting on Christ" by a woman can assume the aspects of a ritual sacrifice, especially one in which the disguised martyr is falsely accused of making sexual advances to another woman.[22] This motif reappears, of course, in secular drama. In *Twelfth Night*, the furious Orsino threatens to kill Viola-Cesario for supposedly making love to Olivia, and the disguised page, in true saintly fashion, agrees to become the sacrificial lamb. "To do you rest," she says to her would-be assassin, "a thousand deaths would die" (V.i.133). In Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster, or, Love Lies a-Bleeding*, the transvestite page Bellario responds to a false charge of having had sex with the Princess Arethusa by agreeing to submit to torture and even possible death to prove her "constancy." "O, kill me, gentlemen," she begs (V.v.80). She, like Viola, is saved only when her disguise is revealed.

For the heroine as well as the saint, unmasking allows Virtue to shine triumphantly forth. In Anson's words, the exposure of the female saint's disguise "purifies the believer, opens the eyes of the blind, and even promises the reader a similar restoration in return for his faith."[23] The unprincipled, would-be murderer James IV, the womanizing would-be rapist Proteus, the jealous Orsino, the revengeful Posthumus, and the tyrannical Cymbeline find redemption through the transvestite heroine's sacrificial ordeal which, above all, proves her Holy Chastity. "Your daughter's chastity—there it begins," the villain confesses to Cymbeline (V.v.179). And indeed, there it ends.

Holy Chastity has power to redeem male evil. But the transvestite heroine in Renaissance drama seems controlled by this power rather than controlling it. Through suffering and self-sacrifice she can partake of chastity's virtue. Ultimately, however, chastity belongs to the male who valorizes it, protects it, or destroys it. In short, Holy Chastity is a virtue of the authoritarian state; a virtue that accepts male aggressiveness. Threatened rape, hinted-at incest, beatings, attempted murder, fights, and even war fill such plays as *James IV, Two Gentlemen, Cymbeline*, and *Philaster*. Moreover, the wife "gives" her husband the magic gift of chastity to guarantee his property and paternity rights. Thus often in these plays, symbolic ring exchanges become a crucial talisman, an emblem of the male protagonist's control of female sexuality.

Putting on male garb for these transvestite heroines signals, in effect, their surrender of female sexuality and their submission to sexlessness. Contrast, for example, the sensuous, sleeping Imogen described by the villain Jachimo ("On her left breast/ A mole cinque-spotted, like the crimson drops/ I' th' bottom of a cowslip. [II.ii.37-39]) with the asexual, angelic Imogen-Fidele who cooks supper and sings like an Angel of the Hearth (IV.ii). Yet only as Fidele can Imogene prove her chastity and bring peace to Cymbeline's chaotic realm. Her proof not only demonstrates Posthumus' control over her procreation and sexual life but also provides absolution for his sins. If such a fantasy reflects patriarchal wish fulfillment, it further accounts for the static characterization of Dorothea, Bellario, and Imogen-Fidele in disguise.

In addition, this masculine wishful thinking helps explain the dramatic disjunctions typical of tragicomic genre which, to misuse Samuel Johnson's phrase, violently yokes together opposites. This form works by juxtaposition—not by causality—and specifically by polarizations of the divine and demonic, of the female and male. This radical discontinuity appears not only in the

conflict of a disguised heroine threatened by a ravening male world but also in a split view of woman herself. Good Imogen contrasts with the wicked stepmother and saintly Bellario with the promiscuous courtesan Megra. Something of the same thing occurs in Shakespeare's schizoid history, *1 Henry VI*, in which Joan is either "Pucelle or puzzel" (I.iv.107); that is, either virgin or whore.

Significantly, male characters in the fantasy world of Renaissance tragicomedy do not fragment into good or bad. Instead, "heroes" like Proteus, Posthumous, Cymbeline, and Philaster are uniformly violent, sexual, and powerful. In the tragicomedies, the more acceptable masculine qualities typical of Bassanio and Orlando become exaggerated into "macho" extremes. Thus in the later plays courage changes to warlike aggressiveness, sexuality into rape, authority to tyranny, and articulateness to vicious invective. Posthumus' misogynistic tirade—"Could I find out/ The woman's part in me—for there's no motion/ That tends to vice in man, but I affirm/ It is the woman's part . . . (II.v.19-30)—illustrates such language. Anthropologists would describe such abuse as a ridding oneself of unwanted evils by projecting them onto a scapegoat, here onto a negative image of woman. Only when the heroine's unmasking reveals the scapegoat to be chastely pure can the "hero" reverse his negative view and accept her, and she redeem him. His murderous urges and violent jealousies are not denied but excused. So tragicomedy's male heroes are free to be both bad and good—in short, to be human. They can change and grow, deform or reform within the destructive tragicomic stage world shaped by masculine values and masculine fantasies of Virtuous Woman.

Not only the tragicomedies but all the dramas considered here conclude with the heroine's unmasking: plots unravel, misconceptions fade, and gender distinctions return. Marriage reinstitutionalizes customary assumptions about male and female. The tragicomedy *Cymbeline* celebrates the marriage that had taken place at the drama's outset. The romantic comedies *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It* bid farewell to all sport with bisexuality and androgyny by returning at the end to traditional gender roles. Indeed, these plays conclude with multiple marriages: two in *Two Gentlemen*, three in *Twelfth Night*, and four in *As You Like It*. Rather than simply showing that "they all lived happily ever after," marriage in these plays rebinds the anarchic forces of gender-free identity loosed by transvestite disguise. Law, order, and authority—in short, the paternalistic world—is firmly reestablished.

In all these plays the comedic world has greater flexibility at the end than at the beginning because the males have become reconciled through the heroine's mediation. Thus in *James IV*, Dorothea's father, the king of England, embraces his erstwhile traitorous son-in-law with, "I call him friend, and take him for my sonne" (V.vi.177); in *Two Gentlemen*, the Duke at last accepts Valentine; in *Philaster*, the usurper King is reconciled to the usurped Prince. The younger men, the sons-in-law, become partners in the patriarchal corporation through the heroines' good offices. As daughters and wives, these divested heroines reconcile man to man and state to state.

In order to achieve her feminine role as peace-maker, the heroine must surrender her free identity. So Rosalind says to her father, Duke Senior, "To you I give myself, for I am yours"; and then, to Orlando she says, "To you I give myself, for I am yours" (V.iv.116-17). Rosalind becomes not a heroine

but a daughter and wife. In these final scenes, the submission of the female characters results in their passive silence. Julia does not speak for the last 52 lines, Rosalind for the last 73, Imogen for the last 84, and Viola for the last 131 lines.[24] Letting the men do the talking means a return to normalcy, to sex and to business as usual. The rebinding of family ties via marriage restores man's social and political hierarchy of both sex and class. King Cymbeline gains not only a daughter, a son-in-law, two lost sons, and a "brother" but even manages to take credit for such plenitude by declaring himself to be "A mother to the birth of three" (V.v.369). The patriarch is restored to his family, the king to his kingdom, the heroine to her woman's weeds, and the audience to the ordinary world where everyone knows what feminine and masculine are. Or do we?

NOTES

[1] For sources of transvestism in Renaissance comedy see Barbara A. Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1976), pp. 2-3, 129-32; and Leo Salingar, *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974), pp. 192-97, 211-18, 238-42, 287-98. For discussions of the use of transvestism in Renaissance literature see the excellent article by Nancy K. Hayles, "Sexual Disguise in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*," *Shakespeare Survey*, 32 (1979), 63-72; also M. C. Bradbrook, "Shakespeare and the Use of Disguise in Elizabethan Drama," *Essays in Criticism*, 2 (1962), 159-68; V. O. Freeburg, *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1915); and F. H. Mares, "Viola and Other Transvestist Heroines in Shakespeare's Comedies," *Stratford Papers, 1965-1967*, ed. B. A. W. Jackson (Hamilton: McMaster Univ. Library Press, 1969), pp. 96-109. For a perceptive analysis of modern literary transvestism, see Sandra M. Gilbert, "Costumes of the Mind: Transvestism as Metaphor in Modern Literature," *Critical Inquiry*, 7 (1980), 391-417.

[2] Quoted by Freeburg, p. 22.

[3] *Cymbeline* III.iv.155, *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974). Subsequent references to this edition will be included in my essay.

[4] Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 186-89.

[5] *Merchant of Venice* II.vii.9.

[6] Northrop Frye, *A Natural Perspective: Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965), p. 76.

[7] *Gallathea* IV.iv. in *The Dramatic Works of John Lilly* (London: Reeves and Turner, 1892), vol. 1. Subsequent references to this edition will be included in my essay.

[8] Peter Saccio, *The Court Comedies of John Lyly: A Study in Allegorical Dramaturgy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), p. 160.

[9] III.ii.5-6: ". . . dost thou think though I am caparison'd like a man, I have a doublet and hose in my disposition?"

[10] Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953), p. 115; p. 116, n. 26, draws attention to the medieval debate between Ganymede and Helen as to whether the love of girls or boys is preferable.

[11] "Introduction" to *As You Like It, The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 366; see also Margaret Boerner Beckman, "The Figure of Rosalind In *As You Like It*," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 29 (1978), p. 44.

[12] Marilyn French, *Shakespeare's Division of Experience* (New York: Summit Books, 1980), p. 116.

[13] Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (New York: Stein and Day, 1972), p. 37.

[14] Ethel Spector Person, "Sexuality as the Mainstay of Identity: Psychoanalytic Perspectives," *Signs*, 5 (1980), 618.

[15] French, p. 121. I have independently arrived at a view of *Twelfth Night* similar to that of Marilyn French.

[16] Robert Greene, *James the Fourth* in *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, ed. John Matthews Manly (Boston, 1897), vol. 2; and Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Philaster; or, Love Lies a-Bleeding* in *Drama of the English Renaissance*, ed. M. L. Wine (New York: Modern Library, 1969).

[17] Lawrence Stone attributes this phrase to Weber in his *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1500-1800*, abr. edn. (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 73.

[18] For an informative account of the Renaissance controversy about male actors playing female parts see J. W. Binn, "Women or Transvestites on

the Elizabethan Stage?: An Oxford Controversy," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 2 (1974), 95-120.

[19] N. Z. Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1975), ch. V. See also Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley, 1976), pp. 115-18, 132-33, and 366-67; and C. L. Barber, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959), *passim*.

[20] Joseph H. Summers, "The Masks of *Twelfth Night*," in *Shakespeare: Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed. Leonard Dean, rev. edn. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967), p. 135; Salingar, p. 193, n. 3; and Warren J. Gadpaille, *The Cycles of Sex* (New York: Schribner, 1975), p. 288.

[21] Book III, Canto iii, ll. 53-61.

[22] John Anson, "The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: The Origin and Development of a Motif," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 5 (1974), 1-32.

[23] Ibid., p. 17.

[24] Although Rosalind, like Gallathea, might seem to have the last word since each returns to give the epilogue, they do so as actors, not characters.

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 91-96
Vol. 56, No. 1

ELIZABETHAN REVENGE TRAGEDY AND THE PROVIDENTIAL PLAY-WITHIN-A-PLAY

Richard S. Ide*

To write in a literary or dramatic genre is necessarily to engage in a dialogue with predecessors in that generic tradition. The writer of epic, for example, in the course of adapting epic themes and conventions to his own poem, self-consciously enters into intense, creative competition with the giants of the past: Virgil with Homer, Dante with Virgil, Milton with Renaissance as well as classical poets. Viewed from a generic perspective, the epic tradition comprises a vast chain of influence stretching across national and cultural boundaries. Happily, the dialogue I wish to record here is more provincial and short-termed; it involves Shakespeare and his contemporaries on the London stage and is largely confined to a period of one decade, roughly 1600 to 1611. The genre is revenge tragedy, and to document the chain of influence I will focus on the "Providential play-within-a-play," a distinguishable variation of the more familiar play-within-a-play devised and perpetrated solely by the passionate, scheming revenger.

The Providential play-within-a-play, normally placed at the catastrophe of an Elizabethan revenge tragedy, is set apart from the rest of the action by a choric announcement or an emphatic change of scene. Whether a literal dramatic performance or a feast, entertainment, or even civil ceremony given a theatrical character through metadramatic references, the episode is perceived to be a play-within-a-play in which heavenly justice is administered. Unlike the more familiar feast or play plotted solely by the revenger (and usually for base, strictly personal motives), the Providential play-within-a-play finds heaven itself directing, applauding, or actually participating in the distribution of justice. Initially adopted by dramatists who perhaps felt pressured to justify the revenge tradition on ethical grounds, the Providential play-within-a-play quickly became as conventional to Elizabethan revenge tragedy as ghosts, feigned madness, or passionate invocations to evil.[1]

In Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* Hieronimo must face the ethical question that will confront a host of stage-revengers after him: whether, in the absence of effective civil law, he has the right to mete out the vengeance that is God's alone (Deut. 32:35). Hieronimo assumes that right, adopting a course of Senecan revenge, usurping God's just government of the world stage. Hieronimo is actor, director, and sole author of the final, bloody play-within-a-play, his "Tragedie," as he calls it (IV.iv.147 and 214).[2] There is no choric testimony to the justice of Hieronimo's revenge, no sense that Providence is directing him as its "scourge and minister," no appeal to heaven for a blessing, no repentance. The play-within-a-play is all Hieronimo's; Providence neither directs nor approves of the device.

The ending of *Hamlet* is significantly different. Indeed, Shakespeare's play is notable for the extent to which Providence actively enters into the affairs of men in order to help Hamlet prosecute the revenge. Those happy

*Department of English, Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90007

coincidences at sea are a good example: Hamlet's intuition about the sealed commission and his uncharacteristically rash decision to open it; the lucky chance that he had some training in calligraphy, allowing him to forge a new commission, and—even luckier—that he happened to have his father's ring in his pocket with which to seal the commission ("even in that was heaven ordinant"—V.ii.48);[3] the chase by pirates, the compelled bravery, his isolation on their ship, their turning out to be thieves of mercy and returning him safely to Denmark. Hamlet had earlier asserted his special relationship to heaven as its "scourge and minister," and these events at sea verify that assertion both for himself and for the audience. Hamlet is a Providential instrument, a player in a Providential scenario.[4]

My theatrical metaphor is not gratuitous. As Anne Barton has pointed out, *Hamlet* is riddled with references to the theater.[5] From the beginning, whether referring to the ghost in the "cellarage" or contrasting his own "motive and cue for passion" (II.ii.561) with those of the player, Prince Hamlet sees himself as playing the role of revenger. One of his early difficulties, of course, is that he does not know whether he is being "prompted" by heaven or hell. What he finally learns, and what those who are "mutes and audience" (V.ii.335) to the last act come to understand, is that Providence, as director of the world stage, shapes the final end of *Hamlet*. No sooner does the prince resign himself to God's will ("There is special providence in the fall of a sparrow. . . . the readiness is all"—V.ii.219-22) than the stage is set—literally—for the Providential play-within-a-play: "*A table prepar'd, Trumpets, Drums, and Officers with cushions, foils, daggers*; KING, QUEEN, LAERTES, *and all the State*" (V.ii.224,s.d.).

A "special providence" is manifestly at work in the final scene, bringing to naught Claudius' elaborate device and presenting an awesome spectacle of divine vengeance. Given Laertes' singular skill as a swordsman and the fact that he will use an uncapped rapier, poisoned in case the hit itself be not fatal, and given the contingency plan involving the poisoned chalice, Claudius' device seems virtually fail-safe. But then the "accidents" occur. Hamlet, who happens to have been practicing, gets the first hits, in celebration of which Gertrude happens to grab the wrong cup; after Laertes' treachery, the swords happen to be switched in the scuffle, and after being fatally hit himself, Laertes, who has grown increasingly Machiavellian, has a change of heart and implicates the king. God's shaping hand is evident in these improbable events, and it is working toward a just purpose. Laertes remarks the ironic justice visited on himself in being killed by the poisoned rapier he wielded against Hamlet: "I am justly kill'd by mine own treachery" (V.ii.307). And when Claudius is hurt by the same rapier and then forced to drink of the cup he poisoned, Laertes again testifies to heaven's precisely ironic justice: "He is justly served" (V.ii.327).

In *Hamlet* the play-within-a-play analogous to Hieronimo's is "The Murther of Gonzago," a device initiated and partly authored by the scheming revenger; revealingly, Shakespeare's unusual revenger uses it to test the ghost. But the play-within-a-play at the catastrophe of *Hamlet* is something quite different. Indeed, one might say that Claudius' "mighty opposite" is not Prince Hamlet, but Providence itself. The duel, a villainous scheme proposed to Hamlet as a "play" (in the sense of a diversion), is ironically transformed into a Providential play-within-a-play, an Elizabethan moral tragedy, an awesome manifestation of God's just punishment for sin.[6]

A similar episode occurs at the conclusion of John Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*. Early in the play, both revengers, Antonio and Pandulpho, use theatrical metaphors derogatorily, Antonio "will not swell like a tragedian/ In forced passion of affected strains" (II.iii.104-05), and Pandulpho dismisses his early Stoic stance as role-playing: "Why, all this while I ha' but played a part,/ Like some boy that acts a tragedy" (IV.iv.47-48).[7] But although the revengers disparage affectation and posturing and play-acting, Act V makes clear that they are nevertheless actors on the world stage with Providence as director and overseer. Like Hamlet, the revengers are playing roles in a divine scenario.

Act V is set apart from the rest of the action when the ghost of Andrugio, acting as chorus, announces that the moment of revenge has arrived. The ghost himself will be present as "spectator of revenge" (V.v.22), but he makes clear that the presiding authority at the horrible feast and mask is Providence:

> Now down looks providence
> T'attend the last act of my son's revenge.
> Be gracious, Observation, to our scene. (V.i.10-12)

But Providence does more than simply attend the final play-within-a-play. When Pandulpho says that "Providence sits clapping of our enterprise" (V.iii.15), he implies that Providence is an approving spectator of the revenge. When the ghost asserts that " 'Heaven's just; for I shall see/ The scourge of murder and impiety' " (V.i.24-24), he implies that Providence is directing its earthly instruments. And when Antonio, while clutching the throat of Piero just before stabbing him, says that "Thus the hand of heaven chokes/ The throat of murder" (V.v.76-77), he implies that Providence is participating in the revenge act through its surrogate agents. I must leave unsettled the intriguing questions of whether *Antonio's Revenge* is a parody of the revenge tradition or a "sardonic travesty of Christian sentiment";[8] for our purposes, it is enough to note that the final play-within-a-play, with Providence presiding over, directing, and applauding the administration of justice, is of a piece with the finale of *Hamlet*.

That *Hamlet* and *Antonio's Revenge* both employ a Providential play-within-a-play is of special interest. For if one agrees with the two most recent editors of *Antonio's Revenge*, who argue that it and *Hamlet* are exactly contemporary and that they are markedly similar not because Marston borrows from Shakespeare or vice versa but because both derive from the play known as *Ur-Hamlet*, then one may speculate that the Providential play-within-a-play (or hints for it) was present at the inception of the Elizabethan revenge tradition.[9] Indeed, Kyd or whoever is the author of *Ur-Hamlet* may well have taken his cue from Belleforest's translation of Saxo Grammaticus' *Historiae Danicae*, where the revenge is moralized as the meting out of God's inexorable justice.[10] Whatever the genesis of the Providential play-within-a-play, however, its use by Shakespeare and Marston seems to have established it as a generic convention to be adapted by subsequent dramatists for their own purposes.

George Chapman begins the final act of *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* much as Marston began the final act of *Antonio's Revenge*: with a choric pronouncement delivered by a ghost. As might be expected of Chapman, Bussy's ghost is wonderfully philosophical; as might now be expected of the tradition, the ghost is a spokesman for Providential justice. He has come

> To urge the justice whose almighty word
> Measures the bloody acts of impious men
> With equal penance, who in th' act itself
> Includes th' infliction . . . like chained shot. (V.i.5-8)[11]

Moreover, the ghost impresses upon Clermont his special relationship to heaven and his obligation to advance "eternal justice,"

> which proportion is
> Of punishment and wreak for every wrong,
> As well as for right a reward as strong. (V.i.93-95)

This choric assertion of Providential justice colors all that follows: the distribution of heavenly justice is assured, and Clermont as revenger will act as heaven's instrument.

Partly because Chapman's own beliefs as well as the immediate dramatic context favor an impersonal, neo-Stoic conception of Providence instead of an active personal deity, and partly because one of Chapman's dramatic purposes is to celebrate Clermont's exemplary heroism, the "presence" of Providence, whether to direct, participate in, or applaud the revenge, is less insistent in *The Revenge* than in *Hamlet* or *Antonio's Revenge*. The ghost states emphatically that "Clermont must author this just tragedy" (V.ii.46); though the unconventional Clermont is not mad, passionate, or scheming, the play-within-a-play is his, not Providence's. On the other hand, Clermont remains a Providential agent. He acts as the "man of fate" (V.v.106), and his revenge is "just" precisely because in meting out "punishment and wreak" for Montsurry's wrong, he is acting not for personal vengeance but on behalf of Providential justice.

If the active personal involvement of Providence is downplayed in the final play-within-a-play of Chapman's *The Revenge*, it is boldly stressed in Cyril Tourneur's *The Atheist's Tragedy*. Tourneur twice uses the convention of the Providential play-within-a-play to demonstrate that evil is punished and virtue rewarded. In the marvelous graveyard scene of Act IV, scene iii, the pious hero Charlemont is a baffled instrument of heaven, moving patiently through an improbable scenario of happy accidents—of perfectly timed exits and entrances, of disguises lost and fortuitously found—and finally materializing dressed as a ghost just in time to scare off the lecherous villain and preserve the virtuous Castabella's virginity. Less fun, but more germane, is the Providential play-within-a-play at the catastrophe. Appropriately, the final episode is a judgment scene devised by the atheist D'Amville but scotched by his "mighty opposite," Providence. Charlemont, falsely accused of murder, is about to be beheaded by D'Amville's own hand when, "*As he raises up the axe he strikes out his own brains*" (V.ii.235,s.d.).[12] As the judge makes clear to Charlemont, Providence has intervened to punish evil and reward virtue:

> The power of that eternal providence
> Which overthrew his projects in their pride
> Hath made your griefs th' instruments to raise
> Your blessings to a greater height than ever. (V.ii.264-67)

Like Claudius, D'Amville sets the stage for what becomes a Providential play-within-a-play; Providence transforms the villain's device into an awesome exhibition of divine justice. More overtly than in *Hamlet*, however, in *The Atheist's Tragedy* God's Providential purpose is effected by direct, miraculous intervention.

God's active intervention in *The Athiest's Tragedy* has been correctly attributed to the Calvinistic bias of the author;[13] but one should also recognize the influence of the generic tradition at the decisive moments of the play, in the churchyard and in the final judgment scene. That tradition of the Providential play-within-a-play, which probably began with *Ur-Hamlet*, extends through Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* to Chapman and Tourneur. But *The Atheist's Tragedy* by no means concludes the dialogue.

At about the same time as Tourneur's *drame à thèse*, Shakespeare adapts the Providential play-within-a-play for *The Winter's Tale* (III.ii), where Apollo passes strict judgment on Leontes' false justice, and for *The Tempest* (III.iii), where Prospero, the virtual embodiment of Providence as governor of the island/stage, assumes his symbolic position "on the top" and uses Ariel to administer the justice of heaven. Even as late as the Caroline period, moreover, John Ford adapts the device for *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (IV.i), where heaven ordains that Hippolyta is hoisted on her own petard, and Philip Massinger adapts it for *The Unnatural Combat* (V.ii), where, much as it had done in *The Atheist's Tragedy*, heaven carries out its own revenge, killing the incestuous murderer Malefort with a flash of lightning. Finally, still a generation later, one finds John Milton adapting the same generic convention for his closet drama, *Samson Agonistes*.

Although *Samson Agonistes* is not concerned with blood revenge, it is a species of revenge tragedy with numerous affinities to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.[14] Given the emphasis on God's just, active intervention in the Providential play-within-a-play, moreover, it is wholly understandable that Milton should adapt this particular convention of Elizabethan revenge tragedy for his dramatic theodicy. When Samson is taken to the "spacious Theater" (1605)[15] of the Philistines to entertain at the festival in honor or Dagon, the enemies of God

> Unwittingly importun'd
> Thir own destruction to come speedy upon them.
> So fond are mortal men
> Fall'n into wrath divine,
> As thir own ruin on temselves to invite. (1680-84)

Like the schemes of Claudius and D'Amville, the Philistines' "spectacle" (1604) is transformed into a terrifying exhibition of divine vengeance, into a Providential play-within-a-play. Though Samson himself loses his life, as the patient minister of divine justice he has fulfilled the role ordained for him by Providence: "O dearly bought revenge, yet glorious!" (1660).

NOTES

[1] On these and other conventional characteristics of the tragedy of revenge, see especially Fredson T. Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642* (1940; rep. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959) and Eleanor Prosser, *Hamlet and Revenge* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1967).

[2] Citations are to *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, ed. Frederick S. Boas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901).

[3] Quoted from *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

[4] On this point, see especially H. D. F. Kitto, *Form and Meaning in Drama* (London: Methuen, 1956), pp. 321-28; S. F. Johnson, "The Regeneration of Hamlet," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 3 (1952), 187-207, who reviews previous relevant comentary; and Fredson Bowers, "Hamlet as Scourge and Minister," *PMLA*, 70 (1955), 740-49.

[5] See Anne Righter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962), pp. 158-64.

[6] Especially relevant to this point is Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy*, pp. 259-63.

[7] Quotations are taken from John Marston, *Antonio's Revenge*, ed. W. Reavly Gair, *The Revels Plays* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1978.

[8] The phrase is Robert Ornstein's in *The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1960), p. 155.

[9] See Gair's remarks in his *Antonio's Revenge*, pp. 18-19; and those of G. K. Hunter in *Antonio's Revenge*, ed. G. K. Hunter, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1965), pp. xviii-xxi.

[10] See Belleforest's translation in *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, VIII (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 110-11, and Bullough's own comments (VIII, 58).

[11] Quotations are taken from George Chapman, *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, ed. Robert J. Lordi, Jacobean Drama Studies (Salzburg: Univ. of Salzburg Press, 1977).

[12] Citations are to *The Plays of Cyril Tourneur*, ed. George Parfitt, Plays by Renaissance and Restoration Dramatists (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978).

[13] See, for example, R. J. Kaufmann, "Theodicy, Tragedy and the Psalmist: Tourneur's *The Atheist's Tragedy*," *Comparative Drama*, 3 (1969-70), 241-62.

[14] John F. Andrews, " 'Dearly Bought Revenge': *Samson Agonistes, Hamlet*, and Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy," *Milton Studies XIII*, ed. James D. Simmonds (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1979), pp. 81-107, is instructive, but it does not discuss this aspect of the revenge tradition.

[15] Citations for *Samson Agonistes* are to *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957).

IOWA STATE JOURNAL OF RESEARCH / AUGUST, 1981 97-104
Vol. 56, No. 1

JUSTICE AND REVENGE IN *THE SPANISH TRAGEDY*

Charles H. Stein*

Discussions of *The Spanish Tragedy* have often emphasized its concept of justice with the result that the play has been identified as "an object lesson in the imperishability of justice,"[1] "an allegory of perfect justice,"[2] and, more recently, a systematized series of analogies "which highlight the ultimate scheme of celestial justice."[3] I suggest that the play too often distinguishes the respective demands of justice and revenge for these concepts to emerge as identical or congruent and, further, that this bifurcation extends from the supernatural framework (Andrea's ghost and "Revenge") to the central dilemma of Hieronimo's tragic situation.

In the supernatural framework, Andrea's ghost rises from the classical underworld in the company of "Revenge" and ultimately satisfies his thirst for vengeance by the bloody spectacle which concludes the main plot. Hieronimo, the dominant protagonist, resists an initial impulse toward revenge for his son's murder and attempts to obtain justice from the King of Spain. He also administers justice while serving as Knight-Marshal at Pedringano's murder trial. In contrast to Bel-imperia, who never sways from her pursuit of revenge, Hieronimo seeks revenge only after being driven mad by the frustration of his attempts to reach the King. Despairing of all justice, he appeals to hell and Proserpine and embraces revenge as his only alternative.

From its inception the play presents instances of formal judgment which illustrate the complexities of serving "justice." In the underworld, as Andrea's ghost reports, an established tribunal was unable to render a judgment. It has been suggested that Andrea's ghost sought justice or revenge in the underworld, but the ghost's words afford little support for such an interpretation. In the course of identifying himself and accounting for his appearance in the company of a figure named "Revenge," Andrea acknowledges that he has been subject to the laws of the classical gods and has met their judges. After his friend Horatio performed the prescribed funerals and obsequies, Andrea was allowed to approach the underworld tribunal merely "to crave a passport for my wandering ghost" (I.i.35).[4] In this, the first of several formal judgments described or presented in the play, no final determination was rendered by the underworld court; instead:

> . . . Minos, mildest censor of the three,
> Make this device to end the difference.
> "Send him," quoth he, "to our infernal king,
> To doom him as best seems his majesty." (I.i.50-52)

Andrea may have understandably expected to receive Pluto's decision of his fate, but his account clearly shows that he did not. Upon reaching Pluto and Proserpine:

*Department of English, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska 68178

> I showed my passport, humbled on my knee:
> Whereat fair Prosperpine began to smile,
> And begg'd that only she might give my doom.
> Pluto was pleased and seal'd it with a kiss.
> Forthwith, Revenge, she rounded thee in th' ear,
> And bade thee lead me through the gates of horn,
> Where dreams have passage in the silent night. (I.i.77-83)

Rather than actively demanding revenge or justice, Andrea has quite passively awaited assignment of his final resting place in the underworld. Instead he finds himself, he is told,

> Where thou shalt see the author of thy death,
> Don Balthazar the prince of Portingale,
> Depriv'd of life by Bel-imperia. (I.i.87-89)

The decision is not explained in terms of justice, but the words are spoken by "Revenge."

In the opening scene of the main plot, the King of Spain renders two formal judgments. The first applies to Balthazar as a prisoner of war; the second determines the distribution of tribute from Balthazar's capture. When Balthazar states that he yielded to both Lorenzo and Horatio, the King allocates their respective rewards. The decision, which extends to granting the prince's armor to Lorenzo as payment for the cost of housing the prisoner, is generally unchallenged and specifically praised by Balthazar. The scene establishes the King of Spain as a source of justice; it also concludes on a note of harmony and prepares for the contrasting Portuguese scene which follows.

In Portugal, the Viceroy admits that his own "breech of faith occasioned bloody wars" (I.iii.34) which have resulted in his son's capture. In discussing Balthazar's fate, the Viceroy fears his son may not be treated justly in Spain. The ensuing exchange with Alexandro distinguishes the claims of justice (through law) from those of revenge (I.iii.43-48). The audience knows that the Viceroy's fear is unfounded because the Spanish King has not been motivated by revenge; indeed, the justice of the King's decision is further emphasized by contrast with the Viceroy's judgment of Alexandro which follows upon Villupo's false testimony that Alexandro shot Balthazar in the back. Here the Viceroy is revealed as an incompetent dispenser of justice because of his inability to set aside his personal fears for the fate of his son.

By the close of the first Portuguese scene, Kyd has presented three rulers acting as supreme judges. In the underworld, Pluto chose to withhold judgment in favor of indulging an apparent whim of his queen. This brought forth Andrea's ghost and Revenge. In Portugal, the Viceroy allowed his personal feelings to cloud his judgment of Villupo's charge. The accused Alexandro was not allowed to utter his defense. Only in Spain did a King render justice, and he did so free from any associations with revenge. Later in the play, Hieronimo will seek justice from this source.

The distinction of justice and revenge in the main plot is chiefly developed through Bel-imperia and Hieronimo. Of the two, Bel-imperia's motivation is straightforward—she seeks Balthazar's death in revenge for his slaying of Andrea. After her conversation with Horatio, she voices her plan in soliloquy:

> But how can love find harbour in my breast,
> Till I revenge the death of my beloved?
> Yes, second love shall further my revenge.
> I'll love Horatio, my Andrea's friend,
> The more to spite the prince that wrought his end. (I.iv.64-68)

In her view, Balthazar is simply a murderer who must die; Horatio will be a means to this end. Bel-imperia never contemplates an appeal to law, rather she yields to an immediate impulse toward personal vengeance.

With Hieronimo the case is more complex. When he discovers Horatio's body, his first impulse is toward revenge:

> To know the author were some ease of grief,
> For in revenge my heart would find relief. . . .
> Seest thou this hankercher besmear'd with blood?
> It shall not from me till I take revenge:
> Seest thou those wounds that yet are bleeding fresh?
> I'll not entomb them till I have reveng'd. . . . (II.v.40-41, 51-54)

As his search for the murderer begins, however, Hieronimo will voice the justice of his cause.

After Horatio's body is carried away, the scene shifts back to Portugal. Here Alexandro's execution is prevented only by the fortuitous appearance of the Ambassador to Spain, who disproves the false accusation whereby Alexandro had been condemned. More than poetic justice is served by the scene, for, on the one hand, it recalls the contrast between the Viceroy and the King of Spain as dispensers of justice and, on the other, it prepares the audience for Hieronimo's cautious evaluation of reports and information that come his way.

When Hieronimo again appears, his solicitation of the "sacred heavens" is cast in words that emphasize the justice of his plea:

> How should we term your dealings to be just,
> If you unjustly deal with those that in your justice trust?
> (III.ii.10-11)

As he cries for "some man, some mean," Bel-imperia's letter falls before him, its contents urging that he revenge himself upon Balthazar and Lorenzo. But Hieronimo proves cautious and commences his own investigation which is interrupted by the need for him to administer justice in Pedringano's trial for the murder of Serberine. The distressing irony of his situation is reflected in Hieronimo's speech, but the immediate issue is presented as a matter of justice rather than revenge:

> Thus must we toil in other men's extremes,
> That know not how to remedy our own,
> And do them justice, when unjustly we,
> For all our wrongs, can compass no redress.
> But shall I never live to see the day
> That I may come, by justice of the heavens,
> To know the cause that may my cares allay?
> This toils my body, this consumeth age,

> That only I to all men just must be,
> And neither gods nor men be just to me. (III.vi.1-10)

In sentencing Pedringano, Hieronimo reiterates the irony of his position:

> For blood with blood shall, while I sit as judge,
> Be satisfied, and the law discharg'd;
> And though myself cannot receive the like,
> Yet will I see that others have their right.
> Despatch! the fault's approved and confess'd
> And by our law he is condemn'd to die. (III.vi.35-40)

These words, emphasizing justice through law, are doubly significant because they are spoken by a judge who has felt the impulse toward revenge. Justice demands that Hieronimo, as Knight-Marshal of Spain, enforce the law whereby convicted murderers must die; revenge prompts him, as father of a murdered son, to seek the death of his son's killers. Both concepts have the same end—the death of murderers—but these different motivations may lead to different means of accomplishing the end.

After the note taken from the body of the executed Pedringano confirms Bel-imperia's letter, Hieronimo decides his course of action:

> I will go plain me to my lord the king,
> And cry aloud for justice through the court,
> Wearing the flints with these my wither'd feet,
> And either purchase justice by entreats
> Or tire them all with my revenging threats. (III.vii.69-73)

In planning to approach the king, Hieronimo commits himself to seeking justice through legal process; but the last two lines of his speech show that he has perceived an alternative, and they imply that Hieronimo views revenge as distinct from justice—i.e., as a private course of action to be threatened in the event that justice is denied him.

When Hieronimo next appears on stage, his frustration is growing toward madness. His erratic behavior and wild speech lead the second Portingale to observe: "Doubtless this man is passing lunatic/ Or imperfection of his age doth make him dote" (III.xi.32-33). The scene that immediately follows is central because it is the only time that Hieronimo is shown approaching the King. Moreover, it establishes that the King is unaware of both Horatio's death and Hieronimo's consequent suit.

Hieronimo's soliloquy, which begins the scene, suggests that his attempt to approach the King has been blocked. The King is actually preoccupied with arranging a marriage of state, and Lorenzo is consciously keeping Hieronimo from him. When the Portuguese ambassador presents payment for Balthazar's release, the King orders the ransom conveyed to Horatio. Upon hearing his dead son's name, Hieronimo cries aloud for justice and Lorenzo moves to silence him. In a fit of passion Hieronimo rails at Lorenzo and concludes with a general threat:

> I'll make a pickaxe of my poinard,
> And here surrender up my marshalship:

> For I'll go marshal up the fiends in hell,
> To be avenged on you all for this. (III.xii.76-78)

The language of the threat suggests abandonment of the course of justice ("surrender up my marshalship") and appeal to hell for revenge.

It is difficult to accept Hieronimo's behavior up to this point as simply the pursuit of revenge or even as the pursuit of justice by means of revenge. Though the discovery of Horatio's body prompted an initial impulse toward revenge, Hieronimo chose to seek justice through appeal to the King. The primacy of justice was reinforced by Hieronimo's role in judging Pedringano. If any one thing is to be identified as the cause of Hieronimo's abandonment of justice in favor of revenge, it must be the mental anguish caused by Lorenzo's success in keeping him from the King. The threat to surrender his marshalship verbalizes Hieronimo's despair of justice and his consequent turn toward revenge as the only alternative.

In the famous "*Vindicta mihi!*" soliloquy, Hieronimo's thoughts point toward revenge alone, and his plan of action specifies Machiavellian duplicity:

> . . . I will revenge his death!
> But how? not as the vulgar wits of men,
> With open, but inevitable ills,
> As by a secret, yet a certain mean,
> Which under kindship will be cloaked best. . . .
> And therefore all times fit not for revenge.
> Thus therefore will I rest me in unrest,
> Dissembling quiet in unquietness. . . . (III.xiii.20-28)

After voicing this decision, Hieronimo is asked to petition the King on the behalf of three unnamed citizens and Don Bazulto, an old man whose son has been murdered.[5] When Bazulto's petition triggers the memory of Horatio's murder, the language of Hieronimo's anguish significantly parallels Andrea's account with which the play had begun:

> Though on this earth justice will not be found,
> I'll down to hell, and in this passion
> Knock at the dismal gates of Pluto's court,
> . . . Till we do gain that Proserpine may grant
> Revenge on them that murdered my son. . . . (III.xiii.108-21)

As his words specify his commitment to revenge, his actions symbolize his despair of justice as he tears the written petition that might have served in a court of law. The man who once administered justice as Knight-marshal is now ready to stage his drama of revenge.

The last act of Kyd's drama brings Hieronimo and Bel-imperia together to enact revenge against Lorenzo and Balthazar. Chiding Hieronimo for his inaction, Bel-imperia threatens to take matters into her own hands: "Myself should send their hateful souls to hell/ That wrought his downfall with extremest death" (IV.i.28-29). Hieronimo's reaction to her words is enthusiastic:

> But may it be that Bel-imperia
> Vows such revenge as she hath deign'd to say?
> Why then, I see that heaven applies our drift,
> And all the saints do sit soliciting
> For vengeance on those cursed murderers. (IV.i.30-34)

In view of Hieronimo's previous decision to approach hell in general or Proserpine in particular, this sudden effusion of references to saints and heaven is pointedly ironic. No mention is made of the justice of their cause; indeed, Bel-imperia has never considered anything but revenge, and Hieronimo has abandoned the course of justice. In place of a saintly audience, the actions of the present revengers are being witnessed by the vengeful ghost of Andrea and his allegorical companion, Revenge.

In deciding to act through the device of the play about Soliman and Perseda, Hieronimo chooses the role that places him on the same moral plane as his enemies: "I'll play the murderer, I warrant you. . . ." (IV.i.133) Similarly, the conclusion of his soliloquy that immediately precedes the play reveals his one-dimensional motivation:

> Behoves thee then, Hieronimo, to be reveng'd:
> The plot is laid of dire revenge:
> On then, Hieronimo, pursue revenge,
> For nothing wants but acting of revenge. (IV.iii.27-30)

In the enactment of the play, Hieronimo achieves personal vengeance when he stabs Lorenzo, and Bel-imperia fulfills the prediction that Revenge had revealed to Andrea's ghost when she kills Balthazar. Even the final words of Bel-imperia emphasize the primacy of revenge rather than justice:

> But were she able, thus she would revenge
> Thy treacheries on thee, ignoble prince: *Stab him.*
> And on herself would be thus reveng'd. *Stab herself.*
> (IV.iv.65-67)

As Bel-imperia's revengeful course has led her to murder and suicide, so Hieronimo's choice of revenge leads him to murder, mutiliation (when he bites out his tongue), and self-destruction.

After the denouement of the main plot, *The Spanish Tragedy* closes with a choric exchange between Revenge and Andrea's ghost. For the first time the ghost's reaction to the events of the main plot is jubilant. At the close of the first act, Andrea protested the apparent good fortune of Balthazar. With the close of Act II, Andrea complained of Horatio's death and Bel-imperia's abuse. Both times Revenge had instructed Andrea to wait patiently. Even the close of Act III revealed an almost hysterical Andrea pleading with the sleeping Revenge to awaken and fulfill the "passage to revenge." Only after Revenge interpreted the dumb-show forming a part of the chorus following Act III would Andrea rest and allow revenge to run its course.

The ghost's progression from initial ignorance through a decision to trust in Revenge and on to ultimate satisfaction parallels Hieronimo's movement from a commitment to pursue justice (through appeal to the King)

through his despair of receiving justice on earth and forward to the pursuit of personal revenge. Viewed from this perspective, the choric elements indicate the evolution of revenge in the main plot and underscore Hieronimo's choice to seek revenge in place of justice. Thus, by the end of Act III, Hieronimo, who once served as Knight-marshal and rendered justice in a formal trial, has committed himself to a course of personal vengeance and, in the chorus, Andrea's ghost is finally content to "sit and watch the rest." The last act stands forth as the fulfillment of revenge, and the final chorus presents the ghost's reaction to the bloody spectacle he has witnessed.

Andrea's enthusiasm has nothing to do with the achievement of justice: "Ay, now my hopes have end in their effects,/ When blood and sorrow finish my desires" (IV.v.1-2). This is why he can include the suicides of Bel-imperia and Hieronimo among the "spectacles to please my soul." Similarly, the intensity of Andrea's hatred is reflected in his final appeal to the underworld emmissary:

> But say, Revenge, for thou must help or none,
> Against the rest how shall my hate be shown?
> . . . Then, sweet Revenge, do this at my request,
> Let me be judge, and doom them to unrest. (IV.v.25-30)

"Let me be judge"—words that might have been Proserpine's when she induced Pluto to suspend his judgment of Andrea's fate in the underworld and to allow her to summon forth Revenge. In this, his final speech, Andrea resembles those who have been associated with the failure to render justice. His bias against those he would sentence recalls the Portuguese Viceroy whose personal feelings contributed to a condemnation of the innocent Alexandro. Significantly, there is nothing to reflect the justice of either the King of Spain in allocating Balthazar's ransom or Hieronimo in judging Pedringano.

To argue that Kyd distinguishes justice from revenge and that in doing so he may reflect the Elizabethan condemnation of private revenge is not to account for the power of *The Spanish Tragedy* or to determine the extent of its didacticism. Though the play may suggest that revenge is morally condemnable, it certainly emphasizes that the impulse toward revenge is terrifyingly human. Some, like Bel-imperia, may embrace the initial impulse and never sway from the bloody course of vengeance. Others, like Hieronimo, may serve the ideal of justice and (as they perceive they ought) pursue justice in place of revenge. But even the strongest may not be able to endure the frustration of their pursuit.

Hieronimo is the heart of the matter because he embodies both an ideal commitment to justice and a human impulse toward revenge. Because a Lorenzo can keep him from a source of justice, and because the pull toward revenge may be strengthened as justice is frustrated, Hieronimo can be driven to despair of all earthly justice and, consequently, to embrace revenge. In its separation of justice and revenge, Kyd's drama stands forth as a tragedy of Hieronimo's painful disintegration rather than a testament to the immutability of justice.

NOTES

[1] Michael H. Levin, " '*Vindicta mihi!*': Meaning, Morality and Motivation in *The Spanish Tragedy*, " *Studies in English Literature*, 4 (1964), 307-24. Earlier discussions of the concepts include Ernst de Chickera, "Divine Justice and Private Revenge in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Modern Language Review*, 57 (1962), 228-32; G. K. Hunter, "Ironies of Justice in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Renaissance Drama*, 8 (1965), 89-104; and Barry B. Adams, "The Audiences of *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 68 (1969), 221-36. More recent treatments have been offered by Scott McMillin, "The Figure of Silence in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *ELH*, 39 (1972), 27-48; Scott McMillin, "The Book of Seneca in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Studies in English Literature*, 14 (1974), 201-08; John Scott Colley, "*The Spanish Tragedy* and the Theatre of God's Judgments," *Papers on Language and Literature*, 10 (1974), 241-53; Margaret Lamb, "Beyond Revenge: *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Mosaic*, 9 (1975), 33-40; and Carol McGinnis Kay, "Deception Through Words: A Reading of *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Studies in Philology*, 74 (1977), 20-38.

[2] Hunter, p. 93.

[3] Colley, p. 248.

[4] All references are to *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Philip Edwards (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1959.

[5] McMillin's discussion of "The Figure of Silence" provides a detailed analysis of Hieronimo's encounter with the "old man."